CALIFORNIANA

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 90158 9292

REFERENCE BOOK

Not to be taken from the Library

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
California State Library Califa/LSTA Grant

http://archive.org/details/memorialsixchine00chin

MEMORIAL

Six Chinese Companies

AN ADDRESS TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES.

TESTIMONY OF CALIFORNIA'S LEADING CITIZENS

BEFORE THE

Joint Special Congressional Committee.

READ AND JUDGE US.

San Francisco, Dec. 8th, 1877.

PUBLISHED BY:
R AND E RESEARCH ASSOCIATES,
PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS OF
ETHNIC STUDIES
4843 MISSION STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
AND
18581 McFARLAND AVENUE
SARATOGA, CALIFORNIA
PUBLISHER,
ROBERT D. REED
EDITOR,
ADAM S. ETEROVICH

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
CATALOG CARD NUMBER

76-124370

REPRINT 1970
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

REF.
323.251
C4409P
1970

77 42

MEMORIAL.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists most respectfully represent to your honorable bodies--

That by joint action of the two Houses of Congress, during the month of July, 1876, a Special Committee was appointed "to investigate the character, extent and effect of Chinese immigration to this country, with power to visit the Pacific coast for that purpose, and to send for persons and papers, and to report at the next session of Congress."

The result of that investigation is now before you. Your memorialists most respectfully call your attention to the fact that by the magnanimous action of your Committee, the Chinese residents of this land were accorded a hearing, through their representatives, during the investigation. Therefore they claim the privilege to address to your honorable bodies this memorial, that they may bring to your notice the sworn testimony of prominent citizens—men of the highest standing, whose honesty, integrity and disinterestedness places their conclusions beyond the possibility of impeachment, in reference to "the extent and effect" of the immigration and residence of our people in this country.

Your memorialists desire to answer in detail the report of a portion of your Committee, by producing the testimony, thus challenging the correctness of that document and its conclusions. That as the representatives of this great Government you may become better acquainted with our people, to the end that the sentiments adopted by the respective nations in the treaty of 1844 may be adhered to or revoked:

"There shall be a perfect, permanent, and universal peace, and a sincere and cordial amity between the United States of America on the one part, and the Ta Tsing Empire on the other part, and between their people respectively, without exception of persons or places."

Again reaffirming this pledge in 1858, wherein the United States bound themselves to treat our people resident here as they required your people resident in China, in these words:

"There shall be, as there has always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Ta Tsing Empire, and between their people respectively. They shall not insult and oppress each other for any trifling cause, so as to produce an estrangement between them; and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively, the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feelings."

It is under such solemn assurances that we are here.

Your memorialists would also call your attention to a memorial emanating from a Legislative Committee of the Senate of the State of California, appointed April 3, 1876. That Committee consisted of five Senators. The result and conclusions of that investigation has been brought to your notice by a printed memorial, for your information on "The social, moral and political effect of Chinese immigration."

We further desire to call your attention to the fact that the "Chinese side of the question" was not permitted to be heard, or a representative of our interest allowed us, whereby we were debarred from having a fair hearing in a matter of vital importance to us. Consequently that investigation was one wholly and entirely *ex parte*.

Your memorialists beg that you will examine with care the testimony we herein present to you, in direct contradiction to the report of that Committee, as well as the "Address to the people of the United States," embodied in the same publication.

Your memorialists would call your attention to the action of your honorable Committee, whereby we were permitted to be represented:

"PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, Wednesday, October 18, 1876.
"The Joint Committee of the two Houses of Congress, to investigate the Chinese question, met this day pursuant to adjournment.
"The following members of the Committee were present:
"Mr. Morton (Chairman), Mr. Sargent, Mr. Piper and Mr. Meade.
"Absent—Mr. Cooper and Mr. Willson."

After debate it was

Ordered, That the representatives of the State Senate, officers of the Central and other Anti-Coolie Clubs; officers or representatives of the municipality of San Francisco, also Messrs. F. A. Bee and B. S. Brooks, representing the Chinese Six Companies, and any officer of the said companies be requested to be present on Saturday, at 10 o'clock A. M., when the Committee will be ready to hear those who desire to be heard, the arguments to be confined to one hour each in length on either side of the question.

The result of the Congressional Committee's investigation is now before you, and embraces the testimony of one hundred and thirty witnesses, representing every class and every calling, and to quote from that report, which says :

" The testimony so taken covers over twelve hundred pages of printed matter, and embraces the views of all classes of the community, and every variety of interest. The committee found a great diversity of opinion, resulting from different standpoints of the witnesses who were examined."

And, referring to the classification of testimony, the report says:

"Although the subject by this means was pretty fully covered, and the inquiry, perhaps, exhausted, the conclusions to be drawn from the mass of testimony may be different to different minds. In the opinion of the committee it may be said that the resources of California and the Pacific Coast have been more rapidly developed with the cheap and docile labor of Chinese than they would have been without this element. So far as material prosperity is concerned, it cannot be doubted that the Pacific coast has been a great gainer."

The State Committee deny this conclusion of the Congressional Committee, and suppressed the testimony of many of their witnesses who held contrary views. On page 4 they quote the low order of Chinese who immigrate here, and claim that according to the castes into which they are divided, etc., etc. In refutation of this we quote their own witness.

S. Wells Williams, Secretary of Legation at Peking, and for forty-one years a resident of China (page 1245, Congressional report) says, in reference to caste and character :

" In these emigrants one sees a class of men, on the whole, above the average of their countrymen over the whole empire, especially in enterprise, ability to read their own language, and skill in mechanics. I consider the Cantonese as the superior portion of the Chinese race, at least superior to those of the northern provinces.

There is no caste among the Chinese, no privileged class or titled aristocracy on the one hand claiming rights over their serfs or slaves on the other, and, therefore, no power inheres in the hands of one portion of society to ship off their drones or their criminals, their paupers or their useless slaves, to other lands, and thus get rid of them.

Those who arrive in California are free men, poor, ignorant and uncivilized indeed, easily governed, and not disposed to make in any way, but hoping to get a good price for their labor."

Page 5, State Senate Committee report, says of servile labor contracts : " Ninety-nine one-hundredths of them are imported here * * * to all intents are serfs."

Mr. Williams says, same page, Congressional report :

" 6th. I know nothing of the existence of any contracts made in China by which emigrants are shipped to America. I have never seen such a contract nor heard one described as containing stipulations by which one party bound himself to work for the other at certain wages for a specified time."

Rev A. W. Loomis (evidence, page 445 Congressional report), of the Presbyterian Board of Missions, for eight years resident missionary in China, and fifteen years in California, says :

"Question—What class of Chinese people visit California ? They represent nearly all classes. There are merchants, a few scholars, artisans of nearly every description in their own country, farmers and gardeners, and common laborers. Far the largest portion are from the rural districts, accustomed to labor at home and expecting to labor while here. A large proportion of them are young men, with many mere boys. They are people who have been bred to industry, with economical habits. Not very many gentlemen of large means come to this country, but there are branches of large mercantile firms established here. No priests or teachers of religion or any of their religious sects have come to California as teachers. * * * There are no coolies brought to California, nor do the six companies import their countrymen at all. All Chinese male emigrants to California are free."

Rev. Otis Gibson (evidence, page 404), connected with the Methodist Chinese Mission here for eight years, testified as follows :

"The Witness—After an experience of about twenty years among this people, I do not hesitate to express my opinion that in simple brain power and possibilities of culture, the Chinese race is equal to any other people in the world. They are capable of learning our language, laws, customs, principles of government, our theories and practices. We know nothing which the Chinese are incapable of learning. I believe the Chinese come here voluntarily in every case.

The Chairman—I should like to ask Dr. Gibson, from his knowledge of the Chinese population, what proportion of the whole number is under twenty-one years of age ?

Rev. Mr. Gibson—My statement would be only an approximation and a judgment. I think perhaps there may be a third of them under twenty-one, and a large proportion of the whole are under thirty. That would be my judgment from my observation among the people in this country. Not far from a third are under twenty-one. A Chinaman, in his reckoning, is always one year older than we would reckon him to be. According to their custom of reckoning he is a year old the day he is born. If he is born the last month of the year he is a year old when he is born, and when he comes to the new year, within five days, perhaps, of his birth, he is two years old; and so it goes on in that way.

The Chairman—Taking the real age, you think that about a third are under twenty-one ?

Rev Mr. Gibson—About a third. Sixteen, seventeen, nineteen and twenty years of age is a common figure for a large number of the Chinamen in this country : and then from twenty to thirty, I think, there is a very large proportion.

The Chairman—How many of them are younger than eighteen ?

Rev. Mr. Gibson—That would be a much smaller per cent. There are a great many small boys, fourteen years of age, but in the whole population it would not be a very large percentage."

William N. Olmstead (evidence, page 828), a prominent merchant of this city, resident of China for eight years, connected with the well known firm of Oliphant, Son & Co., testified :

Those who come here come by their own free will and consent.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the Cantonese boat people, or river men? A.—I have resided in Hong Kong, which is the chief port of Canton, 96 miles from Canton. I have staid in Canton.

Q.—Were you familiar with the inhabitants? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know anything about the river population there, who live and die in their boats? A.—Yes, sir; there is a very large floating population in Canton.

Q.—Is that populati n drawn upon to supply the immigrants who come to this State? A.—I do not think so. I think there are very few of those Canton boatmen who come here. I think they come from the district adjacent to Canton, but I think these boat people remain there and attend to their avocation.

Q.—Have you mingled enough with the lower orders of Chinese there to observe them? A.—I have observed them in my ordinary every day walks.

Q.—Are these men inveigled into coming here? A.—I would consider that almost an impossibility.

Q.—Those who come here come by their free will and consent? A.—The immigration laws in Hong Kong, our own consular laws, and our own laws ought certainly to put a stop to any immigration of the kind. I never heard of any instance in Hong Kong of force being used to put emigrants on board ship."

Trusting that the foregoing evidence as to the class and character of our people generally who have come to this country, and also, whether it has been free and voluntary imigration, we leave for you to decide.

Page 5, of State Senate Committee's report, refers to the degraded female Chinese who come to this country. Your memorialists are happy to say, that the action taken by the National Congress during 1875, has, from the time that the law took effect, entirely stopped this class of immigration. On the same page, reference is made to the small tax paid by the Chinese residents.

Space will not permit us to place before you all the wrongs our people have been subject to in the way of taxation, but we undertake to say, that no class of people resident in this Republican country would have quietly submitted for a long series of years, as our people have been compelled to submit, without strongly protesting in the name of justice and fair dealing. The Hon. B. S. Brooks, a distinguished lawyer, resident here for twenty-eight years, says in his "Brief on the Legislation and Adjudication Touching the Chinese Question," and referred to the Congressional Commission, says, in reference to those "outrageous laws," pages 90 and 91:

"Take for instance, the law declared unconstitutional in the case of the State vs. S. S. Constitution; (42 Cal., 578) It was passed May 3d, 1852. It is not declared unconstitutional until January, 1872. The master never gives

a bond, or pays commutation money. He has received his passage money and performed his contract by bringing the passenger to San Francisco. Whether he is landed, or thrown overboard, does not concern the master; but the Chinaman to land, must pay the commutation tax, say $10. 157,880 Chinese landed between these dates, and at $10 a head, paid 1,578,800 dollars, which was illegally and unconstitutionally exacted from them by officers of the State, acting under color of its laws. The case of Lin Sing vs. Washburn, was decided in 1862. The foreign miner's tax of three to four dollars per month had been collected up to that time. It is difficult to tell how much it amounted to. There had been 87,048 arrivals. If half this number paid the tax for ten years, it would amount to $31,337,280. It should be remembered that the Chinese that came here were nearly all adult males. And it is not consistent with human nature to suppose that the men who collected these taxes, being paid a liberal per cent upon the amount of collections, missed any of them; and some account should also be taken of the immense frauds perpetrated by pretended collectors, and double collections. Of the amount collected under the illegal laundry ordinance, we have not data. The poll tax collected to support schools, to which the Chinese have no access, is three dollars per year for each adult male, and it is claimed that there are 60,000 in this State. Of the amount extorted from them, under the torture of their religious faith by the Cue Ordinance, for no crime whatever, we have data which I have presented, and the process is still in progress. These laws—these five hundred cubic feet law, and the cue-cutting order—have not been held illegal."

In the City and County of San Francisco, Mr. Brooks says, they find on real and personal property taxes for fiscal year 1876–1677, the sum of $58,374.20.

NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF POLL TAX PAID BY THE CHINESE POPULATION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, DURING THE FISCAL YEARS OF

1874–1875:	1,260 at $2 = $2,520 2,496 at 3 = 7,488	Total, 10,008
1875–1876:	14,040 at $2 = $28,080 4,562 at 3 = 13,686	Total, $41,768
1876–1877:	16,564 at $2 = $33,128 2,791 at 3 = 8,373	Total, $41,501

TOTAL POLL TAX OF WHITE AND CHINESE DURING

1874–1875:	43,522 at $2 = $87,044 7,942 at 3 = 23,826	White
	51,464	$110,870	
1875–1876:	34,439 at $2 = $68,878 7,989 at 3 = 23,967 21 at 4 = 84	Chinese.
	42,449	$92,929	

Mr. Sontag (Evidence, page 893 Congressional report) is Chief Deputy in License Collector's office:

Q. Have you any data to give to the commission as to the amount of licenses paid by the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir. [Producing a paper.] This is only an approximate, but is pretty nearly correct The amount of license we collect from Chinese peddlers, who peddle fruits and vegetables in baskets suspended from a pole that they carry on their shoulders, is $11,820 for this year.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. For how long a time?—A. That is for this year. We collect the licenses quarterly. Every three months we sell them a metallic tag showing the months for which the license is paid, which tag they put on their baskets. That is evidence to the police officers and license-officers that these men are duly licensed. We collect from store-keepers and persons who sell liquor, about $3,000 a quarter—about $12,000 a year in round numbers. I suppose it does not vary $500 from that in a year.

Q That makes $23,000 or $24,000 for the whole? A. Yes, sir; about $24,000. There are five hundred and twenty-one store-keepers that we license.

A. Badlam (evidence Page 254), Assessor of the City and County of San Francisco.

Q. What proportion of real estate is owned in fee by Chinese?—A. It is very difficult to answer that question, because there is property that is owned by Chinese in town, some few pieces, and they leave the assessment in the names of white persons.

Q. It is not charged on the assessment roll?—A. They do not change it, and they pay their taxes in some one else's name; but the real estate assessed to Chinamen does not, really, amount to anything. Perhaps $100,000 will cover it.

Q. How is it about their personal property?—A. Their personal property was assessed this year in round figures at $500,000, a little more than that.

Your memorialists beg leave to call your attention to the fact that all the foregoing taxes are paid in the City of San Francisco alone, and that not over one-third of our people are residents there, the same ratio of general taxation is paid by them throughout the State. We are taxed as we enter your gates and again as we pass out, *vide* the 42,449 Poll Tax is paid by 30,000 individuals.

Again we refer to the State Senate Committee's report, Page 5, which says: "And in addition to this alarming fact, we find that "of the one hundred and eighty millions, if not more, earned by "them during their continuance here, the whole is abstracted from "the State and exported to China, thus absolutely impoverishing "instead of enriching the country affording them an asylum."

After a close examination of the testimony aken by hat Committee, we fail to find the least data to substantiate this "alarming fact," and in answer beg leave to call your attention to the following editorial from the *Commercial Herald*, of November 29th, 1877, the recognized commercial paper of the Pacific Coast:

THE CHINESE QUESTION AGAIN.

When we catch a person telling lies to make us believe he is stating facts we are very apt to credit him with bad motives. For some time past it has been bandied about the halls of Congress, and circulated among the credulous of Eastern cities, that the Chinese laborers in California have abstracted from the money wealth of this State not less than *one hundred and eighty millions of dollars*, while they have contributed *nothing* to the State or National wealth. This foul and singularly mendacious statement is to be found in a circular issued as an address to the people of the United States by a Committee of a former California Legislature. Its falsity is easily demonstrated. Prior to the inauguration of steamship communication between this port and China—seven years ago only—the facilities for Chinese immigration were comparatively very limited, and for the maintenance of regular intercourse between those in this country and their people at home, they were still scarcer and more irregular; consequently, there could have been *no* considerable exportation of money to China by our Chinese residents. The whole number of Chinese in California at any time did not exceed 90,000, and to credit them with having "abstracted" $180,000,000 from this State is to allow $2,000 remittance for each individual. Anterior to 1854 the Chinese among us were by no means numerous, but allowing that as many were then here as are now, it follows that when it is assumed or intimated that each laborer among them has accumulated a surplus of $2,000 in but a few years, it must be confessed that they surpass many other people in thrift, economy and other valuable qualities that go to make a desirable population. Many of them however, are not laborers, but merchants and men engaged in manufactures, etc., who must be deducted from the general statement of the circular in question. It is only since steamship intercourse became regular between China and San Francisco that our imports from and exports to that country have acquired a leading position in our mercantile transactions, and from 1849 to the present time the grand total of the precious metals sent to China in payment for her commodities does not exceed $60,000,000. It is, therefore, supreme folly to assert that 90,000 Chinese—yielding the point that they are all *laborers*—have forwarded $120,000,000 more in the same time than was shipped to equalize the entire Chinese commerce with California and the Pacific States and Territories. It is also an insult to the common sense of every intelligent man in the nation. The Legislative circular—which should bring a blush of shame upon the cheeks of its authors—furthermore alleges that "the Chinese have contributed *nothing* to the State or National wealth." We challenge anything like honest refutation of the statement that had it not been for "Chinese cheap labor," California would to-day be very far below the condition of prosperity and advancement she can now boast of possessing. Through its agency we have built up industry upon industry, and established the manufacture of many articles for which we would otherwise be dependent upon outside sources of supply. It was largely through that agency that railroad communications have been had with the East, and have laced a large portion of this State, by means of which Caucasian immigration has been induced, immense tracts laid open to settlement, numerous farms brought under tillage, flourishing towns started where formerly the coyote and prairie dog held sole occupation, and the hum of thrift and industry has succeeded the silence of the desert. Have these things contributed *nothing* to the State and national wealth? But the venom of their charge is that the Chinese send their surplus earnings *out* of the country. It is clear that they must have worked for that money to earn it, and as it is their own lawful property they have as much right to do with it as they please, as the Irish immigrants had and have to transmit millions upon millions during the past fifty years in one unbroken stream, to bring their poorer relatives to a land of greater opportunities and larger personal, religious and political freedom; and certainly were quite as justifiable in so

doing, as the Irish have been in collecting very large sums to inaugurate a war against a friendly country with which we have the closest commercial and other relations. It has been estimated that within the past ten years over two hundred millions of dollars have been taken out of this country and lavished in Europe by rich American travelers, but who has charged any of those people with having committed a gross impropriety for such reasons? This raid upon the Chinese was first commenced by the servant girl faction. It did not exist when in 1856 the Chinese were invited to take a prominent part in celebrating the Fourth of July. Before Chinese servants were received into families the monthly wages paid to girls ranged from thirty-five to ninety dollars per month, and people of moderate means could not afford to engage in wedlock with the faintest hope of going to housekeeping. That which at first was little more than a "tempest in a teapot" was eagerly availed of by partisan hucksters, and used by unscrupulous newspapers, to acquire a very questionable popularity among certain classes The proofs of these statements abound on all sides, and one of the most convincing is found in the malicious, one sided, *ex parte*, and illogical contents of the Legislative circular from which we have quoted.

We might, with propriety, leave our case in your hands right here; but we propose to make you better acquainted with our people, and let you be the judges in this controversy.

Page 6, State Senate report, you will find the following in reference to Christianity and missionary work:

The pious anticipations that the influence of Christianity upon the Chinese would be salutary, have proved unsubstantial and vain. Among one hundred and twenty-five thousand of them, with a residence here beneath the elevating influences of Christian precept and example, and with the zealous labors of earnest Christian teachers, and the liberal expenditure of ecclesiastical revenues, *we have no evidence of a single genuine conversion to Christianity.*

Rev. Frederick E. Shearer (Evidence; page 631 Congressional report)

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Whom do you represent?—Answer. I represent an association of Presbyterian ministers of San Francisco and vicinity. I am the stated clerk of the Presbytery of San Francisco, and the Synod of the Pacific.

Q. Have you a statement there which you wish to present to the commission?—A. I have.

Mr. BEE. Please read it.

We have now an organized church of Chinese only, into which 187 have been received. In the place of worship two Sabbath-schools are held, and an average of 150 receive instruction every Sunday. There are 59 more Chinese communicants connected with various American churches in our denomination alone. Five of these were recently received into the church at San Leandro, and eight into the church at Los Angeles. Our mission work has grown until we have been obliged to appoint for it three Americans, all speaking the Chinese language; and to establish branch missions in Sacramento, San Jose and Los Angeles. Connected with these missions are seven other Americans and several native teachers. We have also found it necessary to erect a home for reclaiming and sheltering the fallen women and instructing them in household arts. During the last year more than $2,400 was contributed—all from this coast—and mostly in small sums, and eighteen women received into this home. Several have made Christian profession, married, and are now leading commendable lives.

Connected with seventeen of our American churches we have schools, in which nearly 1,200 are receiving instruction in the English language and Christian religion. Hundreds of these have renounced idolatry and become interested students of Christianity. Some of them are connected with an undenominational Chinese Young Men's Christian Association in this city, which now numbers about 1,000 members, and in which only those who formally renounce idolatry can become or remain members.

Rev. John Francis (Evidence, page 484 Congressional report):

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You have been in charge of the mission-schools here?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. State to the commission your experience while you have been in charge in educating the Chinese, how long you have been, and what sect you represent.—A. The Baptist. I received an appointment as Chinese missionary by the American Baptist Home Missionary Society about five years since, and have continued, excepting a short interval of a few months, up to the present time, and am still engaged as a missionary in this city. Our mission has been located on Washington Street.

Q How many converts have you had?—A. We have baptized about fifteen in connection with this mission here.

Q. Do you have a day-school?—A. Our school is always in the evening, from six to nine o'clock every evening.

Q. How many scholars are in attendance?—A. We have had 100 pupils, and about six teachers.

Rev. A. W. Loomis (Evidence, page 1117 Appendix). Annual Report Presbyterian Mission of California:

REPORT.

All the departments of missionary labor have been continued as they were reported a year ago, and others have been added.

THE MISSION CHURCH.

This has increased in number; 18 having been added since February 1, 1874, of whom 17 were received on profession of faith. Besides those received into the church in San Francisco, four, the fruits of the branch mission in Sacramento, were baptized and enrolled as members of the Presbyterian church in that city; also, in San Jose four were baptized and received into membership in the Presbyterian church in that place, the fruits of our branch mission there. In Marysville, one was baptized by one of the missionaries while on a visit to that city, and two by the pastor of the Presbyterian church of that place. They are enrolled as members of that church. These, with one formerly baptized at North San Juan, are fruits of missionary labor and of colporteur work in that portion of the State.

Appendix, page 1176, Congressional report:

DEAR BROTHER: Yours of the 12th, asking for a statement of my experience with our Chinese church-members, is before me.

Seven of the members of the First Baptist Church of Oakland are Chinese. More than half of this number have sustained this relation for nearly two years.

Appendix, page 1173:

PACIFIC GROVE RETREAT, MONTEREY BAY,
San Francisco, Oct. 12, 1876.

DEAR BROTHER: The Chinese who have been baptized and received into

the church in connection with this mission will compare quite favorably, on the whole, with the members of Methodist churches composed of other nationalities, as to steadfastness, consistency, advance in knowledge, and growth in grace.

They are apparently sincere, and I think few, if any, have joined the church from selfish motives.

Some of them make considerable sacrifice for Christ's sake, and some have endured persecution even to blows.

Of the forty five baptized by me, one woman has been turned out of the church, because she married a man who has a wife living in China.

One man returned to China, and by his friends and relatives was enticed or forced to deny the faith, and has been expelled. One man living in a Roman Catholic family was induced to leave us, and professed to become a Roman Catholic, but in about one year's time he came back with tears of hearty contrition and asked to be re-admitted. He was received.

One or two of the members of my church are worldly, and give me much anxiety and trouble. One woman, whose husband is not a Christian, has been induced to attend the theater once or twice.

With these exceptions, the Chinese members of my church are making commendable progress in Christian knowledge and experience.

Yours truly,

Rev. Dr. LOOMIS. O. GIBSON.

We have been told that in American courts the rule of evidence is, that if a witness has been found incorrect in the statement of *some* facts, his whole testimony can be impeached. But in this case, your memorialists are charitable enough to assume that the State Senate Committee were debarred from obtaining this evidence from natural causes.

Page 7, State Senate Committee's report:

During their entire settlement in California they have never adapted themselves to our habits, modes of dress, or our educational system, have never learned the sanctity of an oath, never desired to become citizens, or to perform the duties of citizenship.

The injustice of this extract becomes apparent when it is undeniable that State laws have been passed, and are now in force, denying us the privilege of your educational institutions. And we regret to say that the Congress of the United States quite recently debarred our people from becoming citizens; and they add that:

The evidence demonstrates beyond cavil that nearly the entire immigration consists of the lowest orders of the Chinese people, and mainly of those having no homes or occupations on the land, but living in boats on the rivers, especially those in the vicinity of Canton.

It would seem to be a necessary consequence, flowing from this class of immigration, that a large proportion of criminals should be found among it; and this deduction is abundantly sustained by the facts before us, for of five hundred and forty-five of the foreign criminals in our State Prison, one hundred and ninety-eight are Chinese—nearly two-fifths of the whole—while our jails and reformatories swarm with the lower grade of malefactors. * * * The Chinese in California are all adults. They are not men of families. * *

The State of California has a population variously estimated at from seven hundred thousand to eight hundred thousand, of which one hundred and twenty-five thousand are Chinese.

California has a voting population of 155,000. We apprehend that no sane person will claim that the adult white foreign population number over 125,000. But it is asserted boldly by the State Senate Committee that there are 125,000 adult Chinamen in California, and one hundred and ninety-eight are inmates of our State Prison, against *three hundred and forty-seven white foreign criminals.* Comment is unnecessary. Yet it might be of interest to select two races of foreign immigrants resident here, say the Irish and Chinese, and compare the commitments of the two classes. The United States census, 1860 and 1870, gives the number of Irish in California, ten years of age and over, 53,452, 35,000 adults (estimate). Chinese, by Customs returns, 95,000. And we find that from 1860 to 1873, twelve years, there were committed to the State Prison 711 natives of Ireland and 750 natives of China. "While our jails and reformatories swarm with the lower grade of malefactors," say the State Senate Committee.

Rev. Otis Gibson (evidence, page 403), Congressional report:

The official reports of the Industrial School for the year ending July 1, 1875, give:

Total number	225
Chinese	4

The Alms House official report for the same time, ending July 1, 1875, the only one that I had access to:

Total number	498
Native born	143
From Ireland	197
Chinese	none

The hospital report for the same time:

Total number	3,918
Natives of the United States	1,112
Born in Ireland	1,308
Born in China	11

One hundred and eighteen Irishmen to one Chinaman is the way the Chinese are filling our hospitals.

The pest house report, which is the Chinese hospital, for the same time gives: Total number, 22; Chinese, none.

Your memoralists desire at your hands a careful examination of the foregoing evidence in contradiction to the *ex parte* memorial presented to you as facts.

We desire further to say in reference to other crimes charged against our people: 1st. That we never had organized or secret tribunals to administer justice in this country; many of our mis-

understandings and difficulties we have settled among ourselves in the way of arbitration. 2d. That there is not nor has there ever been one of our countrymen brought here under a servile labor contract. Neither is there a single coolie or "serf" within the boundary of this fair and free land. 3d. The Chinese Six Companies never brought or caused to be brought one of their countrymen to this land under or by any servile or labor contract, verbal or in writing, or in any way binding upon in any manner one of our countrymen or any member. Page after page of testimony uncontradicted will be found to sustain these assertions in the report of your committee.

We now most respectfully ask at your hands a careful study of the evidence presented in the following pages that you may judge us, and if we, by our deportment, are entitled to a place in this broad land after twenty-four years' trial. Let your judgment be based upon the Christian's Golden Rule. And your memorialists will ever pray.

AN ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

UPON

THE CHINESE IN CALIFORNIA

SWORN TESTIMONY

OF

CALIFORNIA'S LEADING CITIZENS

READ AND JUDGE

SAN FRANCISCO, December, 1877

Extracts from the opening argument of F. A. Bee, before the Joint Special Committee of Congress, pages 36 and 37 :

And now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, in these few words I have sketched to the committee the outlines or the pedigree of this so-called Chinese question. You are here as a court of inquiry. A demand has been made for the modification or the complete abrogation of our treaty relations with China It is charged that the Chinese residents among us are like a cancer, gradually eating into our vitals, breeding disease, corrupting the morals of our youth, monopolizing the labor of the country, and bringing desolation throughout our fair land. It is openly advocated that it is far better to close the doors of trade and commerce, abrogate all treaty relations between the two countries, rather than endure or foster this so-called evil. If those charges are proved true to your satisfaction, it would be well to inquire who sought this alliance. Was it the Chinese Empire? By no means. The Government of the United States fairly forced the present relations upon the Government of China. First, to break down the exclusiveness of that government we send a fleet of war-ships, and obtain a few concessions. Later, we negotiate a treaty which opens up the whole country to the trade and commerce of our people.

It is under these solemn treaty obligations that the Chinese immigrant has been brought to our shores, opened up the riches of China to our merchant marine, dotted the ocean with our merchant ships, and maintained a line of steamships which is a pride to every American citizen. All these advantages we are willing to forego, and why? Because this great empire, of boundless extent, whose shores are washed by two oceans, three thousand miles apart, is invaded by 150,000 honest toilers. The great State of California, sufficient to support 10,000,000 people, is threatened with destruction because, during a period of 24 years, 150,000 Chinese have come here, and by willing industry have contributed largely to her present standing and wealth.

Let us see under what circumstances he comes and how he is received in this free and enlightened republic—the land of the free and oppressed. I regret exceedingly, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to bring to your attention scenes and acts which have transpired upon the streets of this city, which are a disgrace to any and all civilization. No country, no government, I undertake to say, on the face of God's footstool, has ever permitted the indignities to be cast upon any race of people that the government and municipality of San Francisco and the State of California have permitted upon this class of people. I want to picture to you in what manner we receive these people. I have seen, myself, one of the Pacific mail-steamships hauled into the dock here in this city, loaded, probably, with a thousand or fifteen hundred of these people. I have seen them loaded into express-wagons to be taken to the Chinese quarter. What I say has been seen by thousands of our citizens. I have seen them stoned from the time they passed out of the ship, rocks thrown at them, until they reached Kearny street. I have seen them leaning over the sides of the wagons with their scalps cut open. I have seen them stoned when going afoot from the steamships. No arrests were made; no police interfered. I do not recollect, within my knowledge, (I may be wrong in an instance or two) of ever an arrest being made when these street hoodlums and Arabs attacked these people on their landing here. It does not stop there. There are portions of this city, and I say it with shame, where none of these people dare frequent. There are portions of the city of San Francisco where these Chinamen dare not visit.

* * * I say it with shame, that these people have no privileges. They do not seem to have extended to them the protection of the law in any particular. When a Chinaman lands upon this coast he seeks for work. He comes here as a laborer. He comes here for the purpose of bettering his condition. He comes here a law abiding citizen. We shall show upon this investigation that the Chinese residents of this city and of the State of California compare favorably, and, I think, are the peers of any foreign population which comes here, in their appreciation of the laws and usages of the country. Everything has been done for a series of years to persecute and oppress these people. Acts have been passed which are a disgrace to our civilization. * * *

Extracts from the opening address of Benjamin S. Brooks, Esq., pages 51 and 55, Congressional report:

I have lived here from the beginning of the American occupation. I came here in 1849 with my family, and with my family I have resided here ever since. I have seen San Francisco grow up from a few tents and adobe houses to a great commercial city. I have seen this State grow up. I love the city and love the State. I love it as any man loves his native land. I love her prosperity. Everything that touches it interests me. It is for that reason that when I was at the East and read the memorial which was presented to the Congress of the United States by the representative of these emigrants, demanding legislation for them, my indignation was excited, and I wrote a reply to it, which I sent to the Committee on Foreign relations of the United

States Senate. In that paper I answered each of the charges which was made against these people. I did that at no man's solicitation. I did it simply as a Californian and as a man.

The Almighty has blessed us beyond all other people. He has placed in our hands the means of prosperity and happiness greater than any other people ever had. I feel as if we were throwing away this great prosperity, as if we were casting back in the face of the Almighty the gifts which he presented to us; that we are throwing back upon Him His bounty with scorn and seeking to destroy the foundations of the prosperity of our State and its great and glorious future.

It is, therefore, that I take my stand here, not for the Chinaman, but for the State of California and her people, and ask that they may be heard.

They do not march in these torch-light processions; they never go to these mass-meetings. During the day they are at their counters and about their business, following their trades, working upon their farms. At night they are at home with their families; but if you pass through these streets, day or night, you will see thousands of idle people—people who, if you offer them work, will ask you all sorts of conditions: "Where is it; how is it; what is it; when is it; shall I have this; shall I have that; shall I have the other thing." They dictate terms to you, and these must be just so and so; otherwise they will stay as they are. They walk along these streets, and if there is an excavation for a building being made they will throng the sidewalks, and if there is a dog-fight more of them gather together.

But I do not agree with my friend, Senator Sargent, on that proposition. I believe if a poll of the State were taken on this question to day it would be overwhelmingly against his proposition and in favor of the immigration of Chinese. I have taken some little pains to inform myself upon this matter. It has got to be a sort of a hobby with me. Whenever I meet a man I ask him what he thinks about the Chinese question. But the two political parties are divided almost equally here, and every year when an election comes around, if anybody has an ax to grind, people can band together in a labor union or any other association and dictate terms to any candidate. There are just enough of such people to carry the elections one way or the other; and however conscientious a man may be, he scruples to sacrifice the interests of his party on such a question. Thus both candidates will pledge themselves to vote in favor of an eight-hour law, although both candidates really believe that such a law is the worst possible thing for the laboring man. Yet, if the candidate does not pledge himself for it, the whole labor-union will go against his party. If the question should be distinctly presented to the people of the State, "Shall we stop the importation of Chinese labor?" I think they would say at once, "No." I believe there would be an almost unanimous cry in the negative. * * *

The Chairman. Do you mean to be understood as saying that the anti-Chinese sentiment in this State is confined chiefly to the idle and floating population?

Mr. Brooks. Yes, sir; and more than that—to the foreign population—to the Irish. I have tried, gentlemen, to procure a list of the members of every anti-coolie club in this city. I have sent a man for that purpose to demand a list. The lists were made out, but upon consultation with one member of the committee, as I was informed, they refused to give them to me; but I got one, and here it is (producing a paper).

If you will read the list of names there you will find out that nearly every one of them is an Irishman, and I have no doubt you will find the same if you will take the other lists, I hope you will bring the secretaries before you and make them produce their lists, and I will prove by the poll-lists of the city that they are not native-born Americans, and that they do not represent the American sentiment.

* * * The legislation was aimed at the Chinese, but the Legislature was ashamed to avow it. There was legislation against the foreign miner generally, but it was enforced only against the Chinese. There was legisla-

tion against houses of prostitution generally, but it was enforced only against the Chinese. The 500 cubic feet of air law was against all persons, but it was enforced only against the Chinese. The ordinance to cut off the hair was in terms applied to all, but intended for nothing on earth but to touch the Chinese in their religion—in their tenderest feelings. I will not go through all the topics of legislation. The laundry ordinance was of the same kind; the basket ordinance was of the same kind. There has been this continued legislation against the Chinese. Then, when some of them had been here a number of years, thinking they might safely do it, went to get naturalized, and there was a general movement in that direction, because the idea got abroad that they might be naturalized. You know very well that some of our people applied immediately and urgently to Congress, and at the last session you amended the act so as to exclude them from naturalization.

Would any white man on earth go to a country when treated in that way? Would he buy a homestead, and bring there his wife and family? Is that the way we are to get the China trade? Is that the way we are to have these people domiciled among us? When you look at the history of these people from the beginning down to this day, it is a wonder that they even stay here; and it is no wonder at all that they do not bring their families here.

That we have not overstated this case, we beg to refer briefly to the testimony of our representative citizens, men of the highest standing, judges, lawyers, physicians, farmers, artisans, capitalists, bankers, and divines.

Geo. D. Roberts, sworn and examined, page 436, Congressional report:

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are the president, manager, or main officer of the Tide-Land Reclamation Company?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been a resident of this State?—A. I arrived here in 1850.

Q. You have been engaged in business enterprises since that time to develop the interests of this coast, I believe?—A. Always.

Q. How much tule-land has your company reclaimed?—A. The Tide-Land Company proper started in with 120,000 acres. They have been reclaiming portions of it, but not on a large scale, until recently. I suppose we have partially reclaimed 30,000 or 40,000 acres.

Q. Will you explain to the commission what you mean by tule-lands?—A. We call the overflowed lands forming a delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River, tule-lands, and also lands on the margin of the river farther up.

Q. What do you mean by the reclamation of those lands? What kind of work is it?—A. Building dikes, gates, and ditches, preventing the overflow.

Q. What species of labor have you been employing?—A. Generally Chinamen.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Does this class of labor conflict with white labor?—A. I cannot see that it does. We could not do the work at all with white labor in this State at present.

Q. These lands have lain vacant for 25 years?—A. Yes, sir; they have been of no value at all.

Q. Some of those lands have been reclaimed and crops are now raised upon them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What will an acre of this land produce ?—A. We consider fifty bushels of wheat to the acre about an average crop. I have raised as high as ninety-two bushels of wheat, by actual measurement.

Q. That land would have lain idle until you could have got it reclaimed by labor ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you believe that the tendency of the Chinese laboring classes of this country is detrimental to white labor ?—A. Possibly, to a certain class of white labor; but, to the general prosperity of the country, I think they are a great advantage. I think they fill the places that white labor would fill very reluctantly, and it would be a long time before we could get white labor to do it. I think the wealth they produce stimulates prosperity to such an extent that it gives white men higher positions. I do not think the presence of Chinese here affects the price of intelligent labor. It is possible there may be a class of labor that is affected by it, but to sustain that class of labor alone, we would have to hold back the enterprise of the country.

Q. They have added materially, then, to the wealth of California, in your opinion ?—A. In my opinion the aggregate product of the wealth produced by Chinamen in this State is equal to our mines, including the mines of Nevada and Dakotah. Probably they produce sixty, eighty, or ninety millions a year in wealth.

Q. Do the Chinese purchase lands or rent lands, to your knowledge ?—A. Yes, sir; occasionally; not to any very great extent, but more so recently than formerly. There is a disposition among them now to turn their attention to farming. They think it a more quiet life; they get out of the excitement of the city. Many of them have rented patches, and are paying $25 and $30 a year per acre for lands.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Twenty-five dollars and thirty dollars a year ?—A. Yes, sir; pretty near all the sweet potatoes you get here are raised by Chinamen, on Grand Island and in that neighborhood.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. It is alleged that these men came under contract of service, voluntary contracts, but a species of slavery. The question I desire to ask is, whether, because they do come like that, and that they work in droves, and contract through one man, does not account for the efficiency of their labor ?—A. I think that is a mistake; that there is nothing of that kind at all. I find my Chinamen entirely independent of the bosses. When the bosses do not pay them they come to me. If the boss does not pay them any wages they tie him up and call on us. That has been the case in several instances. I find that each man has his account, and he holds the boss responsible.

Q. Are these bosses Chinese ?—A. They are Chinese.

Page 504 Congressional report:

Solomon Heydenfeldt sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in California ?—Answer. Nearly twenty-seven years.

Q. Were you at one time Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of this State ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many years did you keep that position ?—A. Five years.

Q. You are conversant with the various institutions of California, mining, manufacturing and farming ?—A. Tolerably, sir; practically from observation, etc.

Q. And with the Chinese question, and legislation in reference to it ?—A. I have been an observer of what has been going on for the last twenty-seven years.

Q. The committee are here to get information. I should like to have you detail your information as to the facts, if any, since the Chinese advent to California.—A. I think California owes its prosperity very much indeed to the industry of the Chinese who have come to this country. I think without them we would not have our harbor filled with ships; we would not have had railroads crossing our mountains, and we would have been behind, probably, a great number of years. I think we would not have had as many white people here if the Chinese had not come.

Q. You think, then, that the Chinese who are among us have conduced to bring white people here and give white people homes and employment.—A. I do.

Q. As to the construction of this new railroad, the Southern Pacific, which is some 400 miles in length, would that have been built but for the Chinese, in your opinion?—A. I think not; and I have been assured so by those who are interested in completing it.

Q. It has opened a vast territory of farming land to the immigration of this State?—A. It has.

Q. Do you think that the benefits of the Chinese among us have been widespread?—A. I do.

Q. How do you look upon the Chinese, as a class, for honesty, integrity, etc.?—A. I think they are the best laboring class we have among us.

Q. Do you think they compare favorably with other laboring classes?—A. I think they are the best we have.

Q. Do they not assimilate with us soon?—A. Hardly. Give the Chinese a chance and I think they will assimilate with us.

Q. That chance would embrace the elective franchise?—A. Certainly.

Q. Would you be in favor of giving the franchise to the Chinese the same as to European immigrants?—A. Unquestionably. If the one is entitled to it I would give it to the other; and if the negro is entitled to it, I do not see why it should not be given to the Chinese

Q. Then you regard the Chinaman as equal in all respects to the European immigrants? I see no reason why he is not equal.

Q. Is the Chinaman equal in his civilization and morals?—A. In every respect.

By the CHAIRMAN.

Q. Your profession is that of a lawyer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been on the bench in this State?—A. Yes, sir

Q. The supreme bench?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that?—A. From 1852 to 1857.

Q. From your acquaintance with the population of California of all kinds, making a general comparison, how does the morality and the behavior of the Chinese here contrast with the morality and behavior of an equal number of immigrants from Europe?—A. Taking the classes that we have here before us, the Chinese are something better; I think that they are more faithful, more reliable, and more intelligent.

Q. What is their general character in regard to industry?—A. I think that they have more industry than the corresponding class of whites.

Q. How do they compare in regard to keeping contracts; in their fidelity to engagements?—A. I think they are thoroughly reliable and perfectly faithful to their engagements.

Q. How does the intellectual ability of the Chinaman, so far as your observation enables you to judge, compare with that of Americans in the same corresponding class?—A. I think their general intelligence is greater. My impression is, from my information and observation, that there are very few Chinamen of the ordinary laboring class who cannot read and write their own language. In my intercourse with them I find them always quick to understand and very quick to appreciate. They exhibit also a ready intelligence, much more so than you will generally find among the ordinary laboring class of whites.

Page 530 Congressional report :

Cornelius B. S. Gibbs sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident of this State?—Answer. Over twenty-eight years.

Q. What is your profession?—A. An adjuster of marine losses.

Q. Does your profession bring you in contact with the Chinese merchants of this city and State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the committee what your experience has been with them as men of business and men of integrity.—A. As men of business, I consider that the Chinese merchants are fully equal to our merchants. As men of integrity, I have never met a more honorable, high-minded, correct, and truthful set of men than the Chinese merchants of our city. I am drawn in contact with people from all nations, all the merchants of our city, in our adjustments. I have never had a case where the Chinese have attempted to undervalue their goods or bring fictitious claims into the adjustments.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Undervalue or overvalue?—A. I mean undervalue. You see in general average they pay on the market value of the goods; and as they make the goods less they pay less.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Your business is connected with the white race—with the merchant class here?—A. There is not a merchant in this place with whom we do not have business.

Q. How do the white merchants compare with the Chinese?—A. As a class, I think the Chinese are more honorable than other nationalities, even our own.

Q. Are those with whom you deal generally educated scholars, mathematicians?—A. I think they are the best mathematicians I ever saw in my life.

Q. They are good business men?—A. Yes, sir; in fact, they are the only persons who will go through an adjustment and seem to understand it. I never met a Chinaman that if you gave him any figures to calculate he could not calculate it.

Q. Take the average of Chinese merchants, how do they compare with the average of American merchants?—A. Favorably.

Q. In all respects?—A. In all respects.

Q. Are some of them doing a large business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are their losses generally adjusted without law suits?—A. I never had a law suit with them or never had a complaint from them in my life. You have got to get their confidence and explain to them, and they generally go through with the figuring themselves. They can figure very fast and very correctly, and when they are convinced everything is right there is no trouble. There is no class of people that pay up as quickly as the Chinese. On Saturday we send them notice that the average is closed, and on Monday, by ten or twelve o'clock, all the certificates are paid. I have had fifty and sixty thousand dollars in a case, and they would come straight forward and pay it before twelve o'clock, while we have to send around to the other merchants a month, and sometimes two months, before we get it all from them.

Q. You think they are distinguished for their promptitude in business?—A. I do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you ever visit these merchants at their homes?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you find their houses as cleanly as the houses of American merchants?—A. Yes, sir.

Page 532 Congressional report:

Herman Heynemann sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—A. A merchant.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that business here?—A. Fifteen years.

Q What is the character of your business?—A. I am engaged in importing goods, also in manufacturing.

Q. What character of manufacturing?—A. I am president of the Pioneer Woolen Factory and agent of the Pacific Jute Factory.

Q. Why do you employ Chinese in your factory?—A. Originally we could not get any others at all. At that time it would have been an absolute impossibility to have run the factory upon white labor, simply because we could not get white operatives.

Q. Would the factory have been established with white labor?—A. No, sir. As a matter of fact, even with the Chinese labor, competition has been so active that we have had no dividends whatever.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q What is their character for industry and fidelity?—A. I have found in our factory during the last fifteen years, that we have not had a single case before the police court. All these Chinese laborers live on the premises. They have a building there; and we have not had a single case of any kind before the police court of murder, or rows among themselves, or theft up n the proprietors. I think that speaks well for them. I think there are few factories run entirely by white labor where the laborers live on the premises that could say that much.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the cause, in your judgment, of the hostility to the Chinese?—A. The same cause that has been prevalent all over the earth, strangeness of manners. It used to be in England than any man who did not speak English was a "bloody foreigner." It did not make any difference whether he was the best man in the world, he was a "bloody foreigner," and it was the height of contempt to use that expression. I am just of the opinion of Mr. Wheeler; if this race, instead of keeping themselves in their peculiar dress, were to drink whisky and patronize the bar rooms to-day just like others do, the prejudice would disappear immediately.

Page 542, Congressional report:

Richard G. Sneath sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in this State?—Answer. A little over twenty-six years.

Q You are the president of the Merchants' Bank, I believe, at present?—A. I am vice-president and manager.

Q. You were president of the Merchants' Exchange a few years ago, I believe?—A. I was president of the Chamber of Commerce and manager of the Merchants' Exchange.

Q. You have had extensive dealings with the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you to give your opinion to the committee in reference to their honesty.—A. I have been a merchant most of my time in California. I have dealt a great deal with Chinese, and with the Chinese merchants in this city particularly. I have always found them truthful, honorable, and perfectly reliable in all their business engagements I have done business with them perhaps to the amount of several millions of dollars. I have never had a single one of them to fail to live up to his contracts. I never

lost a dollar by them, one way or the other, in all my business engagements with them.

Q. Could you say that much of the white race?—A No. sir.

Q. During the time that you were a merchant you came in contact with these people in large transactions?—A. O, yes; quite large.

Q. Did it not get to be common during the time you were in mercantile pursuits that a Chinaman's word would be taken for a cargo of goods, while a bond would be demanded of white men?—A. I think it was a rule, as a general thing, that we entered into a written contract with white men, but with Chinamen we did not.

Q. You would take a Chinaman's word?—A. As a general thing.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q What are the general habits of industry of the Chinese?—A. I have employed a good many common Chinese, and find them a very industrious people, and, as a general thing, very reliable. In fact, in a great many situations, I much prefer Chinese to white labor. Then again, as now, I am employing a considerable number of persons, farming pretty extensively, and employ nearly all white men, for the reason that Chinese do not understand farming. It is impossible to understand them and direct them properly on account of not being familiar with their language. They can only be worked in gangs, where they have their own headman; but still, after a while, as they soon take up with our language and pick up a great many mechanical ideas, some of them become very useful. I paid higher wages to Chinamen than I ever paid to white men, as cooks, for instance.

Q. What effect has Chinese labor had upon the growth and prosperity of the State, in your judgment?—A. Without the Chinese labor I do not think there would have been half the material wealth in this State.

Q. What effect has the presence of Chinese and their labor had in the increase of the white population here?—A. I am very well satisfied that the presence of the Chinese has furnished more high-priced labor among the white laborers than we could have had here without them.

Q. What, in your judgment, would be the policy of restricting Chinese immigration?—A. I should think it doubtful policy just at this time. I think it is a question whether a few more would not be an advantage. * * * I think the presence of the Chinamen here in this State has made us familiar with them and their country and their commerce, and has led us into much closer relations. With the vast number of people they have there I believe it will eventuate in a very great blessing to the United States; it will furnish an opening for the labor of our skilled mechanics that we have no other opening for, perhaps. They are now using our flour to a very large extent, and they are using a great many things which we produce here; they are importing live stock of all kinds; they are importing all sorts of manufactured goods. We have not been able to compete here with Europe, particularly in relation to the matter of manufactured fabrics.

Page 512 Congressional report:

Alfred Wheeler sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your profession?—A. I am an attorney at law.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?—A. Twenty-seven years this month.

Q. Are you a real estate owner?—A. Yes, sir; and have been always since I have been here.

Q What business have you been engaged in besides the practice of the law?—A. I have been engaged in farming and in mining, and in the practice of the law; those have been my chief pursuits.

Q. To what extent have you been a farmer and land owner in this State?—A. I have been a land owner to a large extent in the vicinity of this city Do you mean in the extent of acres, etc?

Q. Yes.—A. I own several thousand acres of land.

Q. According to the estimate that you have just submitted of Chinese immigrants, the general opinion of the community is hardly exaggerated as to the number?—A. As to the number it is because people do not generally go into statistics. They see a great many Chinamen in the city and they guess there are a hundred thousand of them, and they imagine that if 400,000,000 would come here they would cover us all up; and they do not look at the impracticability of the thing at all. If we have less than a hundred thousand in the State after twenty-five years of immigration, that is four thousand a year. If we are to go on at the proportion of one hundred thousand for every twenty-five years, it would take two hundred and fifty years for a million to come here. The probabilities are, however, that they could come here faster in future as the white population increases. The one will always regulate the other.

Q. What is your largest estimate of the number of Chinese who have come to this coast?—A. Over and above those that departed?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Less than a hundred thousand.

Q. From the time of the first settlement of California?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State your opinion in regard to the effect which the presence of Chinamen has had upon the progress and growth of the State of California.—A. I think that the immigration of Chinese has been vastly beneficial to the growth of California, and I think it is greatly beneficial to every white man, woman, and child in the State. I think the white laborers of the State are vastly benefitted by that immigration instead of hurt by it. If I did not think Chinese immigration beneficial to white labor I should feel much more inclined to consider that it ought not to be encouraged, because it is not from any humanitarian point of view or friendliness or affection for the Chinese that I think we ought, by any means, to encourage their immigration. If it can be shown that it is beneficial to the white laborer, the white laborer ought to be taught to see that fact, and made to understand that he is working against his own interest when he attempts to shut the door against Chinese immigration.

Q. Does the presence of Chinese labor here increase or diminish the demand for white labor?—A. It greatly increases it. It has opened avennes to white labor which never would have existed but for it. That can be illustrated in a dozen matters * * *

Q. I am only asking you for your observation here.—A. I have found them a pacific, mild, and gentle people, so far as I have had a limited experience with them. Those who have been in my employ as domestic servants I have always found extremely subordinate and respectful, quiet, attentive, and rather avoiding difficulties, in such cases as I have seen, than seeking them. They are conscious, evidently, of the prejudice existing against them. The children of the community are disposed to pelt them with stones, and they avoid the opportunity. I have seen them go around a block rather than pass by four or five boys whom they thought might stone them: not because they personally feared those boys, but they did not want to be subjected to the annoyance.

A What do you know about their provoking conflicts or insults?—A. I never saw them provoke any one.

Page 708, Congressional report

William F. Babcock sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident on this coast?—Answer. Since November, 1852.

Q. You are connected with the commercial house of Parrott & Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Give the commission your views of the effect Chinese immigration has had upon this coast in its past, and what your ideas are of its future. We

are here for the purpose of inquiring into that matter —A. I think in a new country cheap labor is absolutely necessary. I think the effect has been beneficial, and will continue to be beneficial; that instead of driving out labor by cheap labor it increases it. Labor begets labor.

Q. What effect has it had upon the advancement o' California? A. I think it has been very beneficial.

Q. Added materially to our wealth?—A. I think so in very many ways.

Q. In manufacturing?—A. In all the industries where they have been employed. There is one point that I have never seen mentioned before the commission. We probably have 120,000 Chinamen in this State, and they spend at the lowest 25 cents a day. That would be $30,000 a day, or $900,000 a month—in round figures, a million dollars a month that they spend among us. If we take that million dollars a month away, it certainly would do us a very great injury Every thousand dollars' worth of merchandise that we sell in this State, goods of any description, is an advantage if it goes into consumption.

Q. How does the Chinese population in numbers compare with the white population in numbers now and ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago? In other words, has the ratio of Chinese population increased or diminished?—A. I think it has diminished.

Q. Compared with the whites?—A. I do not think the Chinamen have increased in this country since 1865. If they have, they have increased very little indeed, while the white population has very materially increased, as we all know.

Q. Is there apprehension entertained among the intelligent people on this coast of there being too great an influx of Chinamen?—A. I do not find that to be the case among those with whom I converse.

Q. You know of no such apprehension?—A. I know of no such apprehension, except what I read in the papers. The newspapers have very great apprehension of it

Q. What, then, is the cause of the strong feeling or prejudice against Chinamen here; there must be some cause for such a state of things; what is it?—A. I think it arises from politicians, office holders, and foreigners, as a general thing Very many of our population pander to this low taste, you may call it, and join in the outcry against the Chinese in order to get the foreign vote and popularity among them. That is my idea.

Q. State whether or not there is a real competition or conflict between Chinese labor and white labor in this State.—A. I think not.

Q. Are there more laborers than there is labor for them.—A. I think not.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Is it desirable to have within a free commonwealth a non-voting population?—A. Yes. sir; I see no objection to it at all; not a particle. The Chinese do not want to meddle with our politics. They are the most quiet, industrious, and best people I ever saw. They are the most valuable laborers I ever saw in my life. I was up at the Clear Lake quicksilver-mines, in which I am largely interested, four or five weeks ago. There we employ a hundred Chinamen, and it would be almost impossible to get along without them. It is an out-of-the-way place.

Q You said you were not employing Chinamen?—I am a director in the company. We have got about 80 white men and 120 Chinamen. The superintendent told me that every night of their lives every Chinamen bathed himself from head to foot, and if you had asked that question of Daniel McClennan the other day he would have stated the same thing

Q. That was in his testimony?—A. I did not read it. They wash themselves from head to foot. If you go down to Battery street at 4 o'clock in the morning you will see 200 or 300 Chinamen waiting to go into the factories, and if you will look at their hands and feet and neck you will see them as clean and neat-looking people as you ever saw in the world. They are different from the lower white classes.

By the CHAIRMAN.

Q. As to the general integrity of the Chinese in their dealings, what is your opinion of their integrity as a people?—A. I think they pay their debts of all sorts and kinds ten times more promptly than white people. I believe they pay their rents better and more promptly.

Q. What is the character of your Chinese merchants for ability and intelligence, and their manner of doing business?—A. Clear-headed, shrewd, smart, intelligent, bright men. They are ordinary-looking fellows, many of them, as you see them going about the streets.

Q. Are they capable of managing a large business?—A. To any extent. Especially that is true of the hong merchants of Hong-Kong. When Nye failed he owed Han Quo a million Mexican dollars. It never had any effect on Han Quo's business at all whether he lost a million or two millions. If they had proper protection here in this country many of them would bring their money here.

Q What are the Chinese as a nation in regard to mercantile honor?—A. We have six companies here, and I think if one got into trouble and could not pay, the others would come to his relief and give any amount of money required. I have never lost a dollar in my dealings with them in the world. As I told you, they are a shrewd class, sharp buyers.

Page 606, Congressional report:

Donald McLennan sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are connected with the Mission Woolen Mills, I believe?—Answer. I am.

Q. How long have you been in that business?—A. Sixteen or seventeen years.

Q. How long have you been in this country?—A. About nineteen years. * *

Q. How many operatives have you?—A. We have about 600, altogether—about 300 Chinamen and the rest white. * *

Q. How do you look upon them for honesty?—A. I never found a case of theft among them. It is possible that such things might take place and we not know it; but still we have never discovered anything of the kind or noticed that anything was taken away. *

Q. The Chinese, therefore, you regard as steady and reliable?—A. Yes, sir; they are a very steady people. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman in my life.

Q. Do they ever strike for higher wages?—A. Never. I never knew them to do so. * *

Q. What is the difference in the rate of wages that you pay to the two races?—A. We pay our white men from $1 75 to $6 a day, and we pay the Chinamen 90 cents a day.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are the Chinese large consumers of the goods you manufacture?—A. They are.

Q. What line of goods?—A. They buy blankets and underclothing, as well as shirts and drawers, and things of that kind.

Q. Then you have a double interest in having the Chinese here?—A. No; I have the same interest that all business men have.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you regard this State as adapted to the production of cotton?—A. Yes, sir; cotton can be raised here very well.

Q. What is the reason it is not raised in large quantities?—A. Because the price of labor is too high.

Page 616, Congressional report:

Henry C. Beals sworn and examined.

By Mr Bee:

Question. You are connected with the *Commercial Herald*, of this city?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long?—A. From its beginning.

Q. You are familiar with the commercial business of this coast?—A. I have been for the last twenty-six years or more. * *

Q. Our commerce with China bids fair to make huge proportions?—A. Yes, sir; it is increasing every day, and very rapidly. The China steamers go out twice a month. Mr. Williams, the agent of the Pacific Mail company, told me the other day that every steamer went out crowded to overflowing with goods and merchandise; that they were obliged to limit one side. The Chinese buy and handle more quicksilver, probably, than any other class of people here; they handle immense quantities. Hong Kong is our great market for quicksilver.

Q. It would be bad policy, then, in your commercial knowledge, to abrogate treaties, or any portion of treaties, which would tend to retard and cut off this trade?—A. Yes, sir; it would be irreparable. I do not think it would be otherwise than a great injury to the vast commerce of this port. The amount of business we do with Hong Kong and Chinese ports here is of vast proportions. We have a score or more of Chinese merchants who themselves do a vast amount of trading and buying and selling of our own products, such as flour and wheat. Recently they have increased their demand, and are drawing very heavily on our local mills here for barley—early barley—and it is getting to be a trade of very considerable importance. The assortment of goods they take from us is very steadily and rapidly increasing.

Q. And in variety also?—A. In variety; yes, sir.

Q. You meet these merchants on 'change daily?—A. Yes, sir. There are, on an average, twenty Chinese merchants on 'change every day.

Q. What is their deportment there?—A. They are very gentlemanly in all their intercourse with white people; none more so. They are treated with the same respect and attention as any other merchant visiting the exchange, and they are, by many, courted very extensively. So far as their credit is concerned, it is unsurpassed by any mercantile houses in the city. Their credit is A 1.

Q. How does their employment affect white labor?—A. In regard to household servants I will give you my experience in a few words: When I left New York, in the spring of 1850, I had employed a nurse girl who had lived with me ten years, and I paid her $6 a month. After being out here two months or so, I sent for my family, and this nurse girl came out here. I paid her passage, you might say twice over to get her here. She was not exactly shipwrecked, but I had to pay her passage twice over, and I agreed to pay her $50 a month after she arrived here. I continued to pay her $50 a month for several years. To-day a servant girl in that capacity receives from $20 to $25 a month wages. At that time, in 1850, I paid a cook in New York $10 a month. Like service here would cost $30 a month now. That is the regular wages of white cook girls; chambermaids, or what they call second girls here, generally get about $25 a month.

Q. For how many years past have those rates continued?—A. For some years past; six or eight years. I will say that since the agitation of this Chinese question here, within the last six months, it has been a very difficult matter for any one to hire white help, more so than it ever was before. What the actual cause or reason of it is, I do not know; but my own impression is that if it were not for the Chinese boys, as they are called, the Chinese servants that we have in our houses, instead of paying an Irishwoman, a good cook, etc, $25 and $30, we would have to pay what we did when I first came here, from $40 to $50 a month. I speak now of my own knowledge. A good

Chinese servant will do twice the work of any white servant woman you can have here. He will do housework better in every way, and do a great deal more. So far as my observation goes, Chinese servants here are not high servants. They do not work by the hour, eight hours a day, but they work at all times, and are willing. That is my experience. I have a Chinaman in mind now who was employed two years in my daughter's family, until very recently, and he did the work of two servants. I consider that he is worth his weight in gold as a servant.

With a few more extracts bearing directly on this question, we submit this question to your honest judgment regarding the presence of Chinese in California. So much has been said about the disease, filth, leprosy, etc., etc., connected with this people, and uncontradicted, it is due to humanity that the facts should be known.

Page 643, Congressional report.

Arthur B. Stout sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I am a physician.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?—A. Since February, 1849.

Q. Have you practiced your profession from that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you held any office under the State connected with that profession?—A. Yes, sir; I am now a member of the State Board of Health. I have had no other official appointment, although I have been in the public hospitals as physician.

Q. Where have you resided?—A. In San Francisco, constantly,

Q. How near was your office and residence to what is known as the Chinese quarter?—A. Right in the midst of it

Q. You built there before the Chinese came to that quarter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. During your residence there have you known of any disease, any pestilence originating and spreading in there, or spreading from there?—A. No, sir; none.

Q. The Chinese live in that quarter very closely, do they not?—A. Quite closely, sometimes.

Q. How is it that you account for the fact that under these circumstances they are apparently so healthy?—A. Their frugal life gives them more immunity from disease. They eat only what is necessary to live upon. They eat to live and do not live to eat. They are clean in their habits, and they drink no whisky. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman in my life. They consequently obtain a better resisting power to the attack of disease

Q. What is their habit in regard to ablutions?—A. They constantly wash themselves.

Q. The whole person, or only the face and hands?—A. My observation of the men is that they keep themselves clean. Their clothes are clean. As mechanics or workmen they keep themselves very clean.

By the CHAIRMAN.

Q. What is the comparative mortality among the Chinese and the whites of this city—the death-rate?—A. The death-rate is greater among the whites than among the Chinese.

Q. What is the comparative mortality among adult Chinamen and adult white people?—A. The amount is greater with adult white people.

Q. Have they had epidemics in the Chinese quarter?—A. No, sir; The small-pox has been among them, as it has been among others, but I think

there has been less small-pox among them—I mean the ratio of population allowed—than with the whites. When you come to take up the question of small-pox, I think I can exonerate the Chinese from the charges alleged against them of having introduced it.

Q. What has been your experience in reference to the Chinese leprosy?—A. I think that the hue and cry made is simply a farce. Leprosy is a disease of very ancient origin. It had its existence under certain peculiar circumstances of Eastern and East European nations. It has come from Europe when it has come here, and that is exceedingly rare, if at all. It is a disease that is rather passing away. It is a disease of a past epoch, which can never return again, owing to the different changes of civilization and of life that have occurred. Leprosy will probably never exist again. It exists in the Sandwich Islands, where it does not extend, partly because it is quarantined.

Q. You speak of prostitution here, and you think there is an insufficient number of Chinese women engaged in prostitution, not more than is required for the general health of the Chinese?—A. No, sir. I think that if you look at it in a hygienic view, and according to principles of political economy, and not as a question of morality, they have not their adequate supply.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In regard to syphilis, much has been said in connection with the Chinese. Can you throw any light upon this subject?—A They have the disease like other races. Wherever masses of population are crowded together in a large city, of course there is a great deal of disease. I do not think it is any more, nor do I think it is worse, among the Chinese than that which originates with other people. I certainly have seen worse cases of it among the whites in New York, in Europe, and here, than any cases I have seen of syphilis among the Chinese; and I have seen a number of cases with them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You refer now to Dr. Toland's statement?—A. I am giving my own views.

Q. You say the statement about it is nonsense. Do you refer to Dr. Toland's statement?—A. I am not referring to Dr. Toland's statement at all. I forget what he said upon that subject. I am giving my own view. I am not spokesman for Dr. Toland or anybody else. The hoodlums—the boys—go among them, and the white men—sometimes sailors, sometimes the wanderers of the coast—and the Spaniards go among them, and they go more to molest, to annoy, to disturb them, than to use them; and when they use them they do not get more malady than by going to other houses When boys go among them and contract disease, they are of that class and of that vicious habit that they would go there or somewhere else. They will be in mischief, and they will go where the mischief is worse, in order to get the more gratification in their dissipation; and if they contract their first baptism of blood there, it is perhaps better than if they should contract it somewhere else. They deserve what they get, and if they get it cheaper, perhaps it is better on that account. The statement that the morality of our white boys is influenced by going among the Chinese, is a gross exaggeration. Very few, anyhow, go among them for that purpose.

Page 660, Congressional report:

William M. Dye sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Insurance-solicitor, principally among the Chinese.

Q. How long have you been in this city?—A. Eighteen years.

Q. What amount do the Chinese pay of insurance, to your knowledge?—A. They pay of fire insurance probably not less than $5,000 and $6,000 a month. For marine insurance, they pay not less than from $6,000 to $7,000 a month.

Q. Who supports these hundred laundries carried on by Chinese?—A. White people mostly. Some few Chinese patronize Chinese laundries.

Q. Generally white people support these hundred Chinese laundries?—A. Yes, sir.

Page 766, Congressional report:

SAN FRANCISCO, November 16, 1876.

William W. Hollister sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a farmer.

Q. How long have you been a resident of California?—A. Since 1852—twenty-four years.

Q. In what portion of the State are your farming operations?—A. At present, chiefly in the county of Santa Barbara. * *

By the CHAIRMAN;

Q. Is there or not strong opposition to the Chinese among the agricultural people of the State?—A. As to the proprietors, I think there is a common sentiment and feeling in favor of the Chinamen. They are our last resort. They are the only thing that the farmer can rely upon at all. The feeling is common with all of the farmers, except possibly a very few, who are utterly unable to hire anybody at all. There are some men, you might say, who do not want Chinamen, but I do not know them. The feeling is common among the proprietors of Santa Barbara, I know, of very great favor to the Chinamen. In fact, they are doing all the work of that country. There are about four hundred of them there, almost all out in the country, variously employed, some of them chopping wood, some of them in-doors, some of them serving families. Generally, they find such work as they are best fitted for with the farmers of the country there. They are very handy with the bean crop of the country and with the barley. They do the greater part of the work. They adapt themselves to all work, because the others will not do it at the price at which they work.

Q. Is there opposition to the Chinamen among the people of Santa Barbara, a town of about six thousand people?—A. The bummer always goes against the Chinaman, and he is there as well as everywhere else. I never heard anybody else complain of them. The bummer is a man who does not work and does not want anybody else to work. If the Chinaman got $5 a day, I suppose the bummer would go for his place and get it. That is about the reason, I suppose, why they oppose the Chinamen, because nobody can afford to give such wages The man who demands big wages is simply running against himself; he breaks down all employment and nobody can hire him.

Appendix, page 1202, Colonel Hollister says:

I have employed Chinamen almost from the beginning of my life in this State. I have from five to fifteen or twenty as steady laborers, and for special employments, temporarily, many more at a time. I have studied the man as a man more closely, if possible, than I have any other race, and now give you my opinion of him as a worker and man. As a laborer, he is most submissive and kindly, ready to do what you want done, with entire good-will. He descends to the lowest employments, and, when properly treated, thinks of no degradation in the lowest of labors. In short, he is willing to be the mudsill, and take the very bottom round of the social ladder. As a man I have found him honest, and, as a rule, very intelligent. Who ever saw a drunken Chinaman? They are unskilled in most of our labors, but when educated in them I have found them most useful and efficient. When skilled in your

work, their accuracy and promptness are remarkable. For us of California they fill the very places which other laborers will not willingly fill. They perform the menial labors of our households, and in general do so much of our commonest toil that they pave the way for the higher labors of the better races. So necessary are they to us in filling the places they are filling now, that without them we would, if not actually come to a standstill, suffer extreme embarrassment in all departments. With the labor of these Chinese, numbering from fifteen to thirty in different branches of my business, I am able to give work to twenty to fifty laborers of other nationalities. Without their aid, who have thus opened the door to the advent of the higher labor, I would have found it so embarrassing to do anything that I would have been forced to forego many undertakings. In all fairness, considering the place filled by the Chinese in California, how are they to be considered as damaging or degrading to white labor? They do not often fill the positions sought after by others

Q. What is the name of your town?—A. Santa Barbara.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. It is the county-seat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the moral condition of this Chinese population?—A. So good that I think out of the whole 400 Chinese population there have been but five arrests in the course of a year. Two of them were dismissed; two cases were for petty larceny, stealing vegetables, or something like that, from their own people. I never saw a better population in my life.

Q. How does this immigration compare morally with other immigration of the same class of people?—A. So much better that if the teachings of paganism make honest men, as I find the Chinamen to be, I think seriously of becoming a pagan myself. I believe in honesty; I believe in honest men.

Q. What is their physical condition as to health, etc.?—A. Those who are skilled in labor, and understand our work, having had some experience, are the best workingmen I ever saw. I do not think as an average the Chinaman is quite up to the average of the white population in physical strength, though I see exceptions where they are very strong and very good. They are not very strong men, but they are very earnest, good men. They work up to their power as I never saw any other people work in my life.

Q. What is the condition of their health?—A. First rate I rarely see an invalid Chinaman.

Q. Have you noticed among them any predisposition to skin diseases or eruptions, or anything of that kind?—A. Not a bit.

Q. What are their habits in regard to personal cleanliness?—A. Better than that of the whites. My men are the cleanest men I ever had about me in my life. They wash every day of their lives. They shame our own population in that respect.

Q. In your intercourse with them, have you formed any opinion as to whether these Chinamen who are here are free or not?—A. If there was ever a slave among them I never knew it. I treat with my men severally and individually. I have no go-betweens. I say to a Chinaman, generally one who has been a father among them and understands the language well, "I want two more Chinamen; get good men, the best men; go bring them on and I will give them so much."

Q. You employ him merely as a Chinaman to get the men?—A. I take simply any one of them who understands the language and can talk well. I never supposed or believed that there was a particle of peonage or slavery among the Chinamen of California; and I do not believe there is to-day.

Q. Have you seen any evidence of any control exercised by any one Chinaman over another?—A. Not a particle.

Q. What do you say about their truthfulness?—A. They do not lie to me; I never hear them lie.

Q. How is it in regard to their faithfulness in performing their work when you are not watching them?—A. Very much better than any other labor.

The long and short of it, so far as my experience goes, is that a Chinaman desires to do his level best to earn his money; and if he knows he pleases you, he is all the better pleased. I have never seen men more willing, more truthful in my life than the Chinamen are.

Q. How is it in regard to keeping their contracts?—A. I have never had a contract broken by Chinamen yet.

Page 732, Congressional report.

Alexander Campbell sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am a lawyer.

Q. How long have you practiced in this State?—A. Twenty years; five years previously in Oregon.

Q. Have you held any judicial office in this State?—A. I was judge of the 12th judicial district in this State.

Q. What is the opinion of the people of this State, so far as you have gathered it, upon this question?—A. Since the discussion of the question has commenced, in the papers and orally, I have heard and read a good deal about it. I have heard, as a person in business would hear, a matter of that public notoriety discussed; and the conclusion I have come to on that point is that parties disinterested, who have no political objects to gain, taking the intelligent portion of the community, are favorable to Chinese immigration on a limited scale. Of course opinions are very diverse on the subject, but I think the preponderance of opinion is in that direction.

Q. Do you think there is any danger of there being an excess of this immigration?—I think not. I base it upon what I alluded to before, the law of supply and demand.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You recognize, as we all do, that there are some exceptional, intelligent, honorable, high-minded Chinese?—A. I do; but the number of intelligent Chinese compares very favorably with the intelligence of almost any other people that I am acquainted with. So far as their character of intelligence goes, their reading and writing, I never met one who could not read and write their own language.

Page 747, Congressional report.

Samuel H. Dwinelle sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. How long have you resided in this city?—Answer. Twenty-seven years, nearly.

Q. How long have you been judge of the 15th district court?—A. Between twelve and thirteen years.

Q. What are the counties composing that district?—A. San Francisco and Contra Costa.

Q. Is Contra Costa an agricultural county?—A. It is.

Q. Have you had an opportunity of learning the views of the people of the interior on this question which is agitating us?—A. I have to a limited extent; but I have not traveled a great deal over the State.

Q. Have you any interest in this question at all?—A. Not of a monetary character. I have an interest in the question as a citizen. * * *

Q. Is there a strong prejudice among the people of this State against Chinese immigration?—A. I think there is among the laboring classes. Outside of them I do not think it is very strong.

Q. It prevails among the laboring classes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that prejudice or feeling grow out of an apprehension that the Chinese are taking their work from them, or will do it hereafter?—A. I think it does.

Q. Do you mean to say that this opposition is confined to the laboring classes?—A. I think so pretty much, as far as my observation goes. I find that farmers in the interior are always ready to employ Chinese, and in many instances they tell me that they prefer them to white labor. I have heard some of them say that they could not move their crops without the assistance of the Chinese; that if the Chinese were driven from the country our crops could not be moved.

Q. Does this opposition to Chinese prevail equally in the country and in the city?—A. I think not, for the reason that I very frequently see Chinese insulted and beaten upon the streets, and in the interior I never see it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I should like to call your attention to a letter which I have had in my possession since the commission has been in session, in reference to perjury. It is an extract from the *Morning Call*, and occurs in the report of a case held, I think, in your court in August, 1875. It is not signed by any one. I want to ask you as to its authenticity, and by reading it over you can judge. I will read it:

"Mr. MURPHY—I state, as representing the people here with the District Attorney, that the testimony on the part of the people, to establish the main facts, will be the testimony of Chinese witnesses. I also state that this is a surprise to me; that Mr. Flood does not draw the distinction perhaps as the law would, but he has a prejudice against the Chinese as a race; and it is a prejudice of the most vital importance when a man says he would not believe under oath an entire race, unless they were corroborated by another and distinct race. It is a prejudice of the utmost importance, not only against the Chinese while they are here, but against the due administration of justice.

"Mr. QUINT—Your Honor has heard enough of Chinese testimony to know that, without some corroborating circumstances or testimony, you feel it unsafe to render a judgment upon such testimony.

"The COURT (interrupting)—I feel it my duty as a man to state that I have never had occasion to come to such a conclusion. I know that the atmosphere is rank with perjury, not only of Chinamen, but of all classes; but I do not know as there is any reason to believe there is any more perjury among the Chinese than among others. God knows I hope not. The question now is only as to whether this jury is to be excused."—*Morning Call*, San Francisco, August 12, 1875.

This is the language attributed here to you:

"I feel it my duty as a man to state that I have never had occasion to come to such a conclusion. I know the atmosphere is rank with perjury, not only of Chinamen, but of all classes; but I do not know as there is any reason to believe there is any more perjury among the Chinese than among others. God knows I hope not. The question now is only whether this jury is to be excused."

A. That is my language with one exception. "Some others" should be there instead of "others." I said that there was no reason to believe there is any more perjury among the Chinese than among some others.

Page 799, Congressional report:

John M. Horner sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE.

Question. How long have you lived on this coast?—A. I have been here over thirty years.

Q. Where are you residing?—A. I am residing in Alameda County, near the Mission of San Jose.

Q. Near the old Mission of San Jose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your business?—A. Farming, ever since I have been in the State.

Q. Has there been an overplus of labor this fall?—A. There has not in our neighborhood, even with the Chinamen there.

Q. Do your neighbors employ Chinamen?—A. They do. The Portuguese, Frenchmen and Americans employ them. All who own property there employ them.

Q. Without distinction of nationality or politics?—A. Yes, sir; it makes no difference.

Q. Then they look upon them as a necessity as laborers in your neighborhood?—A That is the general impression.

Q. You must be pretty well acquainted in your neighborhood, having been here thirty years. What is the common opinion of people in your neighborhood on this question of Chinese labor; are they for or against it?—A. They are for it, as a general thing. That arises, however, more on account of its reliability than on account of its cheapness.

Q. Do you call the Chinese labor here cheap labor, in fact, in comparison with labor in the Eastern States?—A. No.

Q. You have been East within a few years?—A. No, sir; I have not.

Q. You do not know the wages paid in the Eastern States?—A. I hear that they average about $14 for laborers on the farm.

Q. What do you pay Chinamen here by the month?—A. We pay them $1 a day.

Q. Counting twenty-six days in a month?—A. Yes, sir; and the Chinaman boards himself. Some of them command better wages; but that is the average.

Page 581, Congressional report:

Rev. William W. Brier sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. My business upon which I make a living is raising fruit.

Q. What is your profession?—A. I am a minister in the Presbyterian Church. * * * *

Q. I do not care to go into that topic. I shall let it rest with your statement—A. I should like to state to the committee what I know about the manners of the Chinese. They are a polite people. When I go out to the field the Chinamen bid me good morning in a very polite manner. They are not people easily excited at all; they are very equable in their temper of mind. I have never had any difficulty with Chinamen.

Q. Were not all those characteristics true of the slaves of the South while they were in slavery?—A. The Chinese are a cleanly people; they keep themselves neat and clean and nice; there is nothing offensive about them. Scarcely any of them ever swear; none of them that I have ever known drink whisky. I have never seen but one drunken Chinaman in my residence in California. I did see one man once with a bottle of whisky tied to each end of his pole, and he was reeling from one side to the other, and I said to myself, "That Chinaman is becoming Americanized." I have seen but that one drunken Chinaman. I have never had but one Chinaman come to my house and ask for anything to eat, or to ask if I had anything to give to him; just one individual case, and I suppose there are more than a hundred fed there of white men of other nationalities every year.

Page 597, Congresssional report:

David D. Colton sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are connected with the Southern Pacific Railroad, I believe? Answer. I am.

Q. Are you the vice-president or the President of the company?—A. At this time I am the vice-president. * *

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q I understand it. My question is, what is the origin or the cause of the opposition to Chinamen, the hostility that evidently prevails among a great many of your people?—A. I have asked myself that question a good many times when I have been down at the steamer; and when these inoffensive people, in the legitimate pursuit of their business, were going up from the steamer to their lodging-houses I have seen twenty or thirty of what are termed hoodlums, here, throwing rocks at them. I have seen quiet, peaceful Chinamen going through the street, when grown men would hit them in the face, knock off their hats, and do all those things which, if done to an American in China, the whole American nation would be in favor of a war; they would be in favor of wiping China from the face of the earth.

Q. If Americans in China were treated in the same way?—A. Yes, sir. It is a painful statement for an American to make, under our form of government, but I think there is nobody in this room, who has lived here in the city, who will differ with me on that subject.

Q. How do the Chinese compare, in point of intellectual ability, capacity to understand, with Americans; do you notice any difference?—A. I look upon the American race as a very superior race. I would also rather undertake to get along with an American, probably, than with a Chinaman; but the Chinese are very apt, they learn quickly, they comprehend a thing, and they never drink. I never saw a drunken Chinaman in my life. They are always at themselves; they do not have any sprees. I have heard of this smoking of opium, but out of three or four thousand on the road there are no opium-smokers. There is no trouble with them; they are always on hand in the morning; they do a full day's work; and they are certainly *the most cleanly laborers that we have.*

Page 666, Congressional report.

Charles Crocker sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been in this State?—A. I have been here twenty-six years.

Q. What has been your business?—A. For the last fifteen or sixteen years I have been building railroads. * * * * * *

By the CHAIRMAN: . . .

Q. How long have you lived on this coast?—A. Twenty-six years.

Q. You have been acquainted with the operations of the Chinese since their first arrival here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State what, in your judgment, is their effect upon white labor, whether they have the effect to deprive white men of employment, or have had that effect at any time.—A. I think that they afford white men labor. I think that that presence here affords to white men a more elevated class of labor. As I said before, if you should drive these 75,000 Chinamen off you would take 75,000 white men from an elevated class of work and put them down to doing this low class of labor that the Chinamen are now doing, and instead of elevating you would degrade white labor to that extent. For any man to ride through California, from one end of this State to the other, and see miles upon miles of uncultivated land, and in the mountains millions of acres of timber, and the foot-hills waiting for some one to go and cultivate them, and then talk about there being too much labor here in the country is simply nonsense, in my estimation. There is labor for all, and the fact that the Chinamen are here gives an opportunity to white men to go in and cultivate this land where they could not cultivate it otherwise.

Q. You think, then, that there is no conflict between the interest of the white and the Chinese laborer?—A. No, sir; I think if the white laborer understood and realized his true interest he would be in favor of the present proportion of Chinese labor in this State.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Where were you born?—A. In Troy, New York, on the Hudson River.

Q. Were you born rich?—A. No, sir; very poor.

Q. You worked for a living, did you not?—A. I am a working man, and always have been. I started from home when I was 16½ years old, owing 62½ cents, without a copper in my pocket and not a change of clothes, and I have never received any assistance from any living man since unless I paid him for it and interest upon it.

Q. You were a contractor for the construction of the Central Pacific Railroad? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that you employed ten thousand Chinamen?—A. About that number; I never knew exactly how many.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the character of the Chinese whom you have employed, for temperance?—A. They are all temperate.

Q. Have they peaceful habits?—A. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman on the work, and I do not know that I have ever met a drunken Chinaman on the streets. I have no recollection of ever having seen a drunken Chinaman. I have seen them under the effect of opium. * *

Q. Do you think there are too many Chinamen here now?—A. No, sir; I think the number is just about right. I believe that not long ago there were a few too many of them, but they went away, seeking other places for profitable employment. I believe the law of supply and demand will regulate itself if they are left alone. I recognize a Chinaman as more than an ordinarily intelligent man, and they will not come here unless they can get profitable employment. When there are too many here they will go somewhere else; they have done that repeatedly. There have been times when there was a less number in the State than now, and there have been times in 1864 or 1865 when, I think, there were more Chinamen here than now. Whenever there is a scarcity of labor for these Chinamen, you see them taking the steamers for home; and when there is a demand for their labor, they come.

Q. You think this law of supply and demand would regulate their coming without any legislation by Congress?—A. I do. I believe the best thing to do is to let the subject alone and leave it to regulate itself, and it will regulate itself. There may be a time, for a month, or a year, or eighteen months, when there are too many Chinamen here. but they find they cannot get labor and go away.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. As an old citizen, suppose we should call a convention here, after all political matters have been settled, and pass a resolution saying that both political parties in convention agree to submit to the voters of the State of California the question of Chinese immigration, yes; or, Chinese immigration, no. What, in your opinion, would be the result of that ballot?—A. I believe if it was argued calmly and deliberately before the people, without any of this hue and cry, eight-tenths of the people would vote for the amount of Chinese labor there is here now. You can get up a hue and cry against the best man in the world, and hang him, if the newspapers will only say enough about it. If the politicians and men who harangue the people will talk fast enough and hard enough, you can get them to hang a good citizen; but if you will argue this question legitimately before the people, on its merits, without any partisan feeling, you can come down to any man who owns a little homestead, if it is only worth $500, and I believe that eight-tenths of the people will vote for the amount of Chinese people that is here now. I believe that if to day the question could be presented to the people of California, free from partisan politics—free from that agitating tirade against a race, particularly on account of their color, their manners and customs, and all that—the people to-day would vote against this anti-Chinese sentiment. That is my opinion. That is what I say, and I mix in the community. The men I come in contact with are farmers and men who have got something to work for, and they feel that way. They are in favor of them. I know when I was a boy I assisted in riots in the city of Troy, New York, when the Irish immigration was coming into the country. This same hue

and cry was raised against them, and there were riots against the Irishmen. It was said they were going to overrun the country, and the people were mobbing them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You do not take into consideration the moral question or the effect upon political institutions? You do not consider any question except whether they will stay or not?—A. I consider that as they are wanted for labor they will come, and when there are too many of them here to find profitable employment they will go away.

Q. I thought that your answer perhaps embraced some care for our institutions, that you thought more than one to ten might injure us in some way more than our labor or advancement of material interest would compensate, but I find you eliminate all such considerations?—A. I have never seen in my experience any injury that the Chinamen has worked to any of our institutions. I have never noticed that they have affected the morals of the people. They keep to themselves. If our people keep away from them, the Chinese will not force themselves upon them. I am speaking now of prostitutes. The prostitutes are slunk away in blind alleys, and if our people keep away from them they are not going to go hunting after our people. I believe if our people want to be debauched, they will find plenty of white prostitutes to debauch them in the absence of the Chinese.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. I see that you have no prejudice about this matter?—A. No, not a bit. If there is any one who loves California, it is me. I can prove that I have stuck by old California. I love California, and I love its people.

Page 720, Congressional report:

West Evans sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been in this country?—A. It was twenty-five years in January since I arrived here.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a manufacturer and dealer in railroad ties and lumber.

Q. Have you been extensively engaged in building railroads?—A. Somewhat extensively. * * *

Q. Do they find some one to lead them at those times?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. What class of people generally lead them on?—A. I never had any trouble between white men and Chinamen, except with the Irish. I never had any Americans or Germans or Scandinavians to meddle with the Chinamen at all.

Q. It is the Irish who interfere with them altogether, in your experience?—A. I never had any trouble with any other.

Q. Protestant Irish?—A. No, sir; Catholic Irish.

Q. The Protestant Irish do not seem to interfere with them in any part of the State?—A. They never have with me. I never heard of their interfering with Chinamen.

Q. Then from what source does this opposition to the Chinese arise, in your opinion, periodically?—A. I never heard any business men opposed to Chinamen. It comes through politicians and this class I speak of.

Q. Do you think the Chinese have been a benefit to the State?—A. I think so.

Q. Greatly so?—A. I do not see how we could do the work we have done here without them; at least I have done work that would not have been done if it had not been for Chinamen—work that I could not have done without them.

So much eloquence has been expended, in and out of the halls of Congress, in reference to the extreme filth, squalor and pestil-

ence of the Chinese quarter in this city, that we are compelled to call your attention to the facts. It will be seen that while this city pays an enormous tax for street cleaning, it has not expended one dollar for that purpose in the Chinese quarter for six years. Anti-coolie demagogues would lose much of their anti-Chinese buncombe if it was kept clean.

Dr. Stout, member of State Bord of Health.

Page 649, Congressional report.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How does the squalor and filth of the Chinese quarter compare with other parts of the city, or in other words, is the filth and squalor of the Chinese quarter greater than that of some other parts of the city?—A. The squalor of the Chinese quarter is not much greater than that which exists in other parts of the city from other people. Of course their quarter is disagreeable, because it is perhaps more densely populated, but there is less care taken of it. If ample care were taken by the city authorities toward the drainage and the cleaning, I do not think they would be much inferior to the squalor, for instance, such as I saw nearly at the summit of Telegraph Hill a day or two ago. I was called to see a sick child up there, and the filth and stench from want of cleanliness was terrible. I can take you down to the lower part of the city, below Montgomery street, and show you much more squalor in the form of neglect, want of drainage, and want of proper care, than you would find in the Chinese quarter. There has been a great exaggeration in all those charges against the Chinese.

Q. What is the care bestowed upon the Chinese quarter by the city authorities? Is that treated as carefully and as fully as other parts of the city?—A. I have been under the impression for a long time that it was, but I have since been informed that most of the garbage carts, and the sweeping of the streets is done at the expense of the Chinese, and not at the expense of the city; that they are left to take care of themselves.

Q. That was testified to here. Do the city authorities employ such carts in other parts of the city?—A. The city authorities undertake to clean the city in other parts, and very likely they may extend their care occasionally through that quarter. I see a great deal of cleaning through the Chinese quarter. I see carts going through there, and except early in the morning, when they are required to throw out garbage, the streets are quite clean, such as Pacific street and Jackson street.

George W. Duffield sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. What is your connection with the city government, and how long has it been?—Answer. I have been connected with the police department for the last ten years.

Q. Have you been detailed to special duty in the Chinese quarters?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr PIPER:

Q. What is your beat?—A. Jackson street from Dupont to Stockton.

Q Just two blocks?—A. One block.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are a special police officer, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And paid by the Chinese, and not by the city government?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MEADE.

Q. Are you engaged in any other business or occupation from which you derive any income or profit?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are engaged in cleaning the streets?—A. I pay for that from what

I get from the Chinese. It costs from forty to fifty dollars a month to clean the street there.

Q. You get pay from the Chinese for that?—A. I pay for it out of what the Chinese pay me.

Q. Is the rest of the city cleaned in that way?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. How is the rest of the city cleaned?—A. By the superintendent of streets.

Q. Does the superintendent of streets perform this duty on your beat?—A. I have seen corporation carts up there but twice in five years since I have been on the street.

The entire Chinese quarter is neglected, in this most important sanitary necessity, by the authorities, and the whole burden thrown upon the Chinese. Is it just or honorable to charge that the Chinese quarter is a cesspool of filth under the foregoing evidence of neglect from those who are responsible?

It is boldly asserted that no man could be elected to office who favored or employed Chinese. We present one of the richest, oldest and densely populated counties in contradiction.

Page 796, Congressional report:

John H. Hill sworn and examined.

By Mr. Bee:

Question. How long have you been a resident of California?—Answer. I came to California in July, 1850.

Q. Where have you resided?—A. Principally in Sonoma County. I have been East occasionally to visit my children, but Sonoma County has been my place of residence.

Q. What has been your business there? Have you been a farmer in Sonoma County?—A. Yes, sir; cultivator of fruit principally.

Q. Do you employ Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please state what kind of laborers they have made, as to their honesty, integrity and habits.—A. I find them, from experience, to be temperate, industrious, honest and good laborers, creating no trouble whatever.

Q. Is it a common practice in Sonoma County to employ Chinese in that business, fruit raising?—A. I think in my neighborhood there must be, perhaps, some five hundred Chinamen employed. It is principally a vine growing district.

Q. They are engaged, then, largely in cultivating the grape for the farmers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you get white labor to do that work?—A. I do not think we could. I think it is one of the industrial resources of the country that would have to be abandoned if it depended upon white labor. There are certain seasons of the year when a large accession to the ordinary number of hands is required, when the crop is ripening, and I do not think white men could be got on the spur of the moment to do the work.

Q. What is the sentiment of your people generally, your neighbors, and the people of Sonoma County with whom you come in contact, in reference to Chinese labor?—A. I think it is favorable, if I may judge from circumstances and what I know.

Q. That is a Democratic county?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Largely so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. One of the richest counties in the State, I believe?—A. I think it is one of the best counties in the State; perhaps as well improved as any other.

Q. Is it your son who is a member of the State senate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He was elected as a Democrat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was he employing Chinese at the time of the election?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And before that?—A. Before the election.

Q. Has he employed them since?—A. Yes, sir; entirely.

Q. I have a vague impression that your son polled a very large vote at the time he was elected to the senate. Please state it in the aggregate.—A. I think there were some 3,300 votes polled in the county, and I think he received 2,700 or 2,800 out of the 3,300. I do not think that there was a laboring man in the district who voted against him on account of his employing Chinese labor.

Q. You consider that a pretty fair test—that that is the public opinion upon that question?—A. I should think so.

To give the curious an insight into the religion of our people, we quote the testimony of a distinguished traveler and scholar, Chas. Wolcott Brooks, who visited China to study the people and their civilization. Page 941 Congressional report.

Charles Wolcott Brooks sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Are you a resident of this city?—Answer. I am.

Q. What official position did you hold in China, if any?—A. Not any. I was agent of the Japanese government here, about seventeen years, Japanese consul.

Q. You have been to China?—A. Yes, sir; a good many times.

Q. What is your opinion of the Chinese who come to this country, for honesty, integrity, etc.?

Mr. PIXLEY. Do you confine the witness to the commercial classes?

Mr. BEE. I refer to all classes. The witness can explain by headings.

The WITNESS. I imagine there are all classes among the Chinese, as there are among our people. It depends very much upon their position in society and their education, but I think the honor of the Chinese mercantile classes stands quite as high as the average of any race. I think that the mercantile losses by Chinamen are vastly less than by almost any other single nationality.

Q. It has been testified to here to-night that the Chinese are thieves. Is that your experience among them?—A. No, sir:

Q. What is your opinion of the moral condition of China as compared with other nations, excluding the United States?—A. As I understand the religion of China——

Q. I do not speak of the religion, but the moral condition.—A. That is the way of reaching it, I think; because if you wish to get at the moral condition of a nation you must look at their springs of action. When I first went to India and traveled through all those countries, I made up my mind that the only way to understand a people was to first learn their religion. When you learn the rules that govern their actions you can judge of them, and you can judge whether they are influenced according to their belief. That is all you can expect of any nation. The Chinese religion, as I understand it, is very much like what might be called pure spiritualism. It is very much like modern spiritualism, supposing it to be pure. I am not speaking of the Buddhists, but of the religion of the masses of China. Their religion is called Fung Shuy, to a great extent. Fung means wind and Shuy means water, and taken as a compound word, it means wind and water.

Q. Are there not certain moral principles acknowledged by all nations as good and evil which are distinct and separate from religion?—A. Yes, sir; but if you take the Chinese religion in its purity it is a very pure religion. It is not dogmatic theology, but it is very pure in its principles. You may say of them as we would say of a Christian, that a good Christian must be a good man; and a man who lives up to their religion must be a good man. They are both very pure religions, and, I think, on the average the Chinese live up to their religion pretty nearly as well as any other nation that I know of.

Appendix, page 1218.

Confucius, who is sometimes called the "Star in the East," whose writings are still respected by scholars of all nations, affirmed that his work would be completed by a true saint, to be looked for and found in the West. He recorded in the Shu-King, 500 B C, the germ of our golden rule—"Do not unto others what you would not that others should do unto you"—the great doctrine of reciprocity. And there we find that the famous "*vox populi, vox Dei*" of later Rome was but a transcript or repetition from this book, or the more ancient Chinese authorities from which it was compiled. He inculcated, "Honor thy parents, that life may be happy," and enjoined family affection as a duty. No crime, in Chinese eyes, exceeds a violation of filial duties. Family ties are their closest bonds, and family honor is their constant pride and greatest restraint. Their religion inculcates strict honesty, and they believe in "Fung Shuey," or sweet influences from departed ancestral spirits. Education is esteemed one of the chief ends of life, which, they hold, should be universal. Toleration is a principle taught in their religion, as well as a higher law. "Original equality of man before law," and "Aristocracy comes of intellect, not of birth or wealth," have with them long been fundamental principles. These are their bulwarks of national strength, and combined, form a religion inculcating the purest moral principles, encouraging neither cruelty nor sensuality. In these lie the secret of that perpetuity with which their type of humanity has quietly sustained itself through centuries, while Bactrian, Assyrian, and Persian kingdoms, with polished and mighty Rome, have, in turn, erred from these high principles and yielded up their national life.

Laboring Chinamen, when poor and in debt, live, save, and thrive on wages far below our laborers, because honesty is inculcated in their religion; but experience has shown that after they are forehanded, they become more free in the distribution of their money, purchasing freely what will most conduce to their comfort. Human nature is singularly alike the world over. It is natural to use the gains our labor has brought us. As a people, they are neat, orderly, and skillful; not readily excelled in handicraft; frugal, industrious, teachable, patient, and intelligent. They make excellent house-servants, and may be trained to cook skillfully in any style. When taught by French cooks, it is difficult to excel them. With one explanation thoroughly understood, they will need no further instruction or correction. They may occasionally be sullen, but never stupid. They are not given to excessive hilarity, but are quiet; peaceful, and persistent. Their manipulation is careful, and often extraordinary. They would make dexterous cotton-pickers; never bungling ones.

The "Six Chinese Companies"—what they are and who they are. The Rev. Mr. Loomis says, page 446, Congressional report:

The six companies. These are commercial guilds. The people from different sections belong to their several companies, analogous to the Hibernia, Saint Andrews, Sclavonian, Italian, German, or New England societies. These societies have their by-laws, their presidents, secretaries, treasurers, interpreter, etc. These officers are chosen by ballot every year, and receive their salaries. They are for mutual aid. For certain benefits which are extended to the members they are willing to pay the dues and taxes imposed. The officers of these companies, together with prominent men among the merchants and others connected with the company, are called together to deliberate and advise on occasions of important events, such as a murder, a riot in the mines or anywhere, a quarrel between members of different companies, the failure of some Chinese firm, or threatened persecutions or any impending danger, or to make arrangements to receive and do honor to any dignitary. These meetings are simply advisory. They act often as arbitrators in difficulties, so as to prevent their people, if possible, from going to law; or when their countrymen have been robbed or murdered in the mines, they take steps to procure, through the government officers, the apprehension and prosecution of the offenders.

Some of the companies in early California times built and supported hospitals for their countrymen. An old building down on what was called Washerwoman's Bay was built and supported by the Chinese for a hospital in early times. These companies do not import coolies; they are not immigrant associations; they are not civil or criminal courts to try and execute offenders, nor are they secret combinations for the purpose of subverting or interfering with the course of justice in the countries to which their people go to sojourn.

Rev. Otis Gibson gives the Commission his explanation of the Six Chinese Companies. Both these gentlemen speak the Chinese language. Page 406, Congressional report:

The famous "six companies" are simply voluntary associations for mutual protection and benefit. It is the universal custom of the Chinese, when emigrating to any new country, to at once form themselves into a guild or association of this kind; and every Chinaman from the same region naturally seeks membership in this guild. They at once open a hall or general meeting-place, and often connect with it a temple or altar to the local divinities of their native place. They elect annually their officers in a very democratic way. Differences that arise among members are referred to the officers and leading influential members for arbitration and settlement. Advice and aid are given to the new comer and to the sick. They are not mercantile firms in any sense; neither are they courts of justice, but voluntary associations for mutual aid and benefit. They do not claim, nor do they exercise, any judicial authority. Cases are constantly occurring where their advice and arbitration is not accepted by the parties, and the disputes are brought into our courts of justice. All the restraining power which these companies hold or exercise over the people is through an arrangement with the various steamship companies, by which no Chinaman can purchase a passage to China without first procuring a permit of departure from these companies. They claim to do this in order to prevent dishonest Chinamen from running away before their debts are paid. Any anxious creditor may leave his accounts against a Chinaman with the company to which the debtor belongs, and no permit will be granted until an amicable settlement is made.

Frederick W. Macondray sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you lived in this city?—Answer. I have been here twenty-four years or more.

Q. You are of the house of Macondray & Co.?—A. I am.

Q. It is an old mercantile house here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your house has been extensively engaged, I believe, in the trade with China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What have been your relations with the Chinese with whom you have dealt as to their integrity, honesty and ability, and as business men?—A. From all our dealings with them here and in China I do not know any class of merchants, I think, who are more honest and upright or who have a better reputation for integrity than the Chinese.

Q. To what extent in round numbers do you deal with the Chinese in a monetary point, annually?—A. Perhaps $500,000 or $600,000 a year. We have never lost a dollar by them, to my knowledge, in twenty-six years.

Q. You have business relations with the white people?—A. Of course.

Q. How do they compare with Chinese in their honesty and integrity as merchants, favorably or otherwise?—A. They do not compare, of course, as favorably as the Chinese.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about $500,000 or $600,000 annually being your trade with the Chinese, and I simply wanted to get at the aggregate of your business.—A. Possibly half of it is done with the Chinamen.

Q. You say you have never lost a dollar in your traffic with them?—A. Not to my knowledge, never a dollar.

Q. Have you had losses?—A. Of course. I only speak of my own knowledge. I have been in the house some sixteen years, and in that time I am quite sure that we have never lost a dollar by the Chinese.

Q. Have you had losses? Have you lost by white people?—A. Certainly, we have. Of course, we must have done that.

Q. Are your contracts with Chinese generally made in writing?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I have ever made a contract with a Chinaman in writing.

Q. They are verbal contracts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they comply with them?—A. They do

Q. What is the physical condition of the Chinese who come here?—A. I think their physical condition is good. I think they are healthy and strong.

Q. From your observation of the class who have been coming here for 25 years, is it liable to breed disease by coming in contact with our race?—A. I do not know that I am able to pronounce on that subject. I think, as a rule, they are strong and healthy, able-bodied men.

Q. You know of no contracts ever having been made for servile labor, here, like the coolie system?—A. No; I never knew a case of that kind. We have never had anything to do with bringing Chinese here or importing them in any way. We have had offers of that character from the Southern States to take them to Louisiana, but never have done anything of the kind at all. I really know nothing about their importation.

Page 489, Congressional report.

SAN FRANCISCO, November 11, 1876.

Joseph A. Coolidge sworn and examined.

By Mr. Bee:

Question. Are you the secretary of the Merchants' Exchange. Answer. I am secretary and manager of the Merchants' Exchange.

Q. How long have you been in that occupation?—A. Since the organization of the association in 1866.

Q. How long have you been in this city?—A. Twenty-seven years nearly.

Q. Please state to the committee what information you have in reference to the Chinese that you come in contact with, whether there are any of them who are members of the Merchants' Exchange. Have you a statement which you could refer to?—A. I have a brief statement which I shall read. We have seven Chinese firms as stockholders and twenty-four as subscribers to the Merchants' Exchange. The subscribers are to be seen daily in the room and on 'change during the hour; they are intelligent, shrewd, courteous, and gentlemanly, honorable in their business transactions, and compare favorably with people of any other nationality. I have been informed by merchants who have had extensive business transactions with them that the usual contracts in writing were unnecessary, their word being a sufficient guarantee for their fulfillment, and in a term of years, in which business to the extent of millions of dollars was transacted, not one cent has been lost by bad faith on their part. I have never been acquainted with a Chinamen in any station in life who could not read and write in his own language. In cleanliness of person they are remarkable. I have observed them closely in their various occupations, and on the streets, and cannot call to mind an instance of dirty face or hands, or of soiled garments.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Nearly twenty-seven years.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the number of Europeans immigrants in this city, taking Germans, Irish, English and all?—A. I have no data upon which to base an opinion.

Q. Is the entire European immigration equal to the number of Chinese?—A. I think not.

Q. How do the Chinamen engaged in mercantile business and in manufactures compare with the European immigrants who are engaged in the like business, who are merchants, manufacturers, and so on?—A. I think the Chinese compare favorably in every respect.

Q. What is the general mercantile character of the Chinese for capacity and integrity?—A. I think they have no superior.

Q. Are some of them engaged in large business?—A. Yes, sir; very large business.

We are charged daily through certain papers that we are represented "by paid agents" and "paid attorneys." Page 901, Congressional report.

Benjamin S. Brooks affirmed and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How long have you lived here?—Answer. Since 1849.

Q. What is your profession or occupation?—A. I am a lawyer, admitted to the Supreme Court of New York, and of this State, and of the United States.

Q. You have been present here examining witnesses. In what capacity do you appear here?—A. I really do not know. I appear here because I saw by the newspapers that the commission had been kind enough to mention my name among those who would be permitted to be present.

Q. Are you employed by anybody to appear here?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any fee promised or in expectation from any quarter?—A. No, sir, I have not been requested by anybody to appear here. I am a pure volunteer. I felt constrained to come when I saw my name mentioned, because while I was at the East, during the past summer, going there with my wife on a jaunt of pleasure, I saw in the newspapers a copy of the memorial filed by Messrs. Pixley, Casserly and Roach. I thought it was incorrect, and I wrote a letter addressed to the chairman of this committee. I sent it to my agent at Washington, and requested him to see the chairman of this committee personally with it. He was too much engaged at that time to attend to the matter, and the letter was communicated to other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I afterward wrote a reply to this memorial, which I sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. It was printed; I had it printed just as I was leaving; in fact, the proof was sent to me on my way, and I corrected it on the railroad. Having done so much in recommending, as I did, in addition to communications, that the Senate, before proceeding to legislate or to make treaties, should inquire into the facts concerning the matter, I felt somewhat in duty bound to give such assistance as I could to the committee to ascertain the facts.

Q. Are you employed by Chinamen as their attorney in their own affairs?—A. No, sir; I have no Chinese clients whatever.

Q. State whether there is or is not a strong public sentiment in this city, beginning first with the city, against Chinese immigration, either opposed to it altogether or in favor of its limitation.—A. I think there is no such public sentiment There is a very strong, violent, and loud public sentiment in a certain class of the population, but I do not think it is a large class. In the country I think it is a small minority. I took considerable pains to ascertain the sentiment as I came down across the country, conversing about the matter with every one I met on the road and at the hotels. I have continued the practice since I came here, inquiring of every one that I met. The people that I meet and converse with probably do not represent the entire people. I do not suppose that I am in the habit of meeting all classes of the people; but, so far as my observation extends, this opposition is confined to a class.

Q. How numerous is that class? Take, for instance, the city of San Francisco.—A. I think that the class in this city is large. I think that the foreign voting population in this city outnumbers the native.

Q. You think that the foreign voting population here outnumbers the native?—A. Very considerably. I had the register looked over with a view to ascertain the fact; the proportion of foreign-born voters is about 55 per cent., and that of course gives in this city a preponderance of that element; it is mainly in that element that this violent opposition exists; but not all of that class are in this opposition. A good many of them are quite content to

take their chance with the Chinese or any other immigrant who comes here.

Q You state that those who are opposed to Chinese immigration in the country are a small minority?—A. I think a very small minority.

Q. Is there an apprehension here among well-informed people—or among people, I will not use any qualification—that the State is liable to be overrun with Chinese; that there is danger of that?—A. There is no such apprehension among educated people. I doubt very much whether there is such an apprehension among any people to any very great extent. I think the opposition to the immigration does not arise from that source or from that cause.

Q You say that not all the foreign element is in that opposition?—A. No, sir; not by any means; but I should think that very nearly all of the Catholic Irish are in that class. I think it would be hard to find a Catholic Irishman who was not an anti-coolyite. That class, of course, is very considerable. I think all the hoodlums of the city are anti cooly, and think all the bummers are anti-cooly, and those are two classes which are quite numerous in addition to the Catholic element.

Q. You speak about the treatment which the Chinese receive. What do you mean by that?—A. They have been in this city insulted, assaulted, beaten and killed. In the interior, probably, they have suffered more even than here. As I came down across the country I saw a great many Chinamen at work in the worked-over placer beds. I was told then and I have always heard it said that if they happen to strike anything worth a white man's working, the whites take it. There have been a great many assassinations. In the report of the Senate committee in 1861 you will find a statement made of the number of assassinations in the mines, and they were mostly by officers of the State.

Q. I have not seen that report I believe.—A. It is with the reporter, and is to go into the appendix A short time ago at Truckee the cabins of some Chinese miners were set on fire, and the Chinamen shot as they emerged from the blazing buildings. There was an effort to punish the perpetrators. Some parties were arrested. Upon trial of the cause some white men swore distinctly to the fact of the killing, and an equal number of white men swore that the evidence given by the former witnesses was untrue in every particular; they denied directly and distinctly everything, and of course the perpetrators escaped; there were none punished. I have myself seen the Chinese when they landed at the foot of Second street. I live upon Rincon Hill, and I used to come up Second street on my way to the city. I have seen them when coming from the steamer, and I have seen boys along the street striking them as they went along, others throwing things at them—potatoes, stones, anything that came handy I have often seen Chinese boys with their heads cut and their faces bloody; and instances of that kind I have heard very frequently from my friends who were eye-witnesses of similar scenes, but I have never heard of any effectual punishment. The instances that Judge Dwinelle gave of trials in his court were unqualified murders, without the slightest particle of mitigation; but you cannot get a jury to hang a man for murdering a Chinaman, I think, in this State.

Much has been said and published to the world concerning the slavery said to exist among the Chinese, and that they are unable to leave the country. We have shown by the foregoing evidence the falsity of the charge. We now produce extracts from a witness called on the part of the anti-Chinese people.

Page 65, Congressional report:

Frederick F. Low, sworn and examined:

Mr Pixley. Without going through all the usual preliminary formalities, I will state that Governor Low was formerly a member of Congress from this State, collector of the port of San Francisco, subsequently Governor, and later minister to China.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. With what favor do you understand their government would receive a proposition on our part to limit this immigration or to cut it off entirely?—A. I could not form an opinion.

Q. Would they receive it offensively?—A. It is mere speculation, but I should say they would improve the opportunity to try and limit us in China to a similar degree.

Q. To cut off our intercourse?—A. Yes; that would be the natural outcome of it.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Is it not a fact that Chinese labor has a tendency to degrade the dignity of labor?—A. I do not think so.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You say they have an arrangement with the steamship companies that no Chinaman shall be taken back to China until he produces a certificate from these companies that he is free from debt?—A. They will not take a Chinaman back unless in that way. That was the arrangement.

Q. Is it a written contract?—A. No; it is an understanding between them; no written contract. In other words, they say that it is proper for a Chinaman to pay his debts before he leaves the country, and they want to see that his debts are paid.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you regard Chinese labor as in the nature of slave labor here?—A. No; I do not.

Q. The Chinese labor, as between them and their employers here, do you regard in the nature of free labor entirely?—A. I thi k so.

Q. Is there a surplus of labor on this coast, taking the two kinds together? A. At the present moment, I should say no.

Q. Has there been at any time?—A. Never, in my opinion.

By Mr. KING:

Q. You think there is not a surplus of labor in the State at the present time?—A. Yes, sir; in my opinion there is no surplus.

Q. You think that the labor of the Chinese is not any cheaper in comparison than white labor in the Eastern States?—A I should think not.

To further show the *ex parte* character of the State Senate Committee's report, we call your attention to the extract from evidence of ex-Governor, ex-Member of Congress and late Minister to China, the Hon. F. F. Low. Governor Low's testimony covers quite eleven pages, taken before that committee, and from his long residence in China and high standing as a citizen, his testimony would be and is exhaustive as well as disinterested. Yet in the memorial laid before you, page 29, he is quoted, and only one line and a half, thus, page 5, evidence:

That the immigration comes, with but slight exceptions, from the single Province of Canton, and that it is of the lowest class.

And what makes it a disgrace and a humiliation to a truth loving people is, Governor Low gives no such evidence, but says,

Evidence, page 5, State Senate Committee investigation:

Mr. MCCOPPIN.

Q Don't the Chinese come from different parts of China to Hong-Kong to take ships there, just as emigrants from England, Ireland and Scotland used to go to Liverpool?—A. Yes, sir. But take the Chinese here and you would

not find one in a thousand—probably one in five thousand—but that came from Kwang-tung, the province of which Canton is capital. There are their homes; they are all from one section of the country. We have Anglicized Canton, made that name out of the original Chinese words "Kwang-tung." So far as it appears from all evidences, all the emigrants from Hong-kong are freemen; indeed, I understand that the British emigration law forbids anybody but voluntary emigrants embarking; forbids a vessel clearing unless all the emigrants on board are voluntary emigrants, and that is to be certified to before the vessel can have a clearing.

Mr. EVANS:

Q. You are then of the impression that the people do not come here as peons, under contract—that that theory is not correct?—A. No, sir.

Had Governor Low's evidence been quoted in full in the State Senate Committee's memorial to Congress, it would have completely stultified the evidence of a large number of the witnesses to whose evidence your especial attention is called by that publication.

It is due to you, as the representatives of this great nation, that your attention should be called to the status of the witnesses, whose evidence is placed before you, representing both sides of this question on behalf of the State Senate Committee. Extracts from the testimony of twenty-eight witnesses is placed before you; thirteen are officeholders, ten of whom are connected with the police and police courts, not one of whom had failed to indorse the platforms of the "anti-coolie" organizations in order to obtain their places. Three are Chinese, one under pay of the city police, one county official noted for his anti-coolie sentiments, one supervisor who has made his name famous as the author of the cubic air and cue-cutting ordinances. Such is the so-called disinterested evidence presented for your consideration.

With a view, and for the purpose of showing the other side of this question, we herewith submit the evidence of the best citizens of California, men of undoubted honesty and integrity, taken from every calling, representatives of all that goes to build up society and develop the vital and best interests of any community or State, composed of judges, bankers, merchants, farmers, railroad officers, manufacturers, physicians, clergymen, secretaries, ex-foreign ministers and consuls, missionaries, insurance agents, editors and lawyers, nearly all of whom are pioneers, and have grown up with and noted the moral, social and political advancement of California from her infancy to the present time. It is the sworn testimony of such that the Chinese residents of California place before you for your consideration and judgment, and not men occupying official positions, or aspiring thereto, who endorse and pledge themselves to every anti-coolie, and other secret organizations brought into existence to persecute our people, that they

may secure the suffrages of this irresponsible class. Such evidence cannot be disinterested.

OUTRAGEOUS TREATMENT OF THE CHINESE.

Our people have just cause to complain of the manner in which they have been treated. Coming here under the most solemn treaty assurances and obligations, agreed upon by two great nations, the one Christian, in its civilization, the other pagan, with the most profound assurances that the compact was to be the supreme law of the land, and reciprocal in all its workings, that the two peoples were to protect each "from all insult or injury of any sort," that they should "not insult or oppress each other for any trifling causes, so as to produce an estrangement between them." Have these obligations been carried out as becomes a great and Christian nation like the United States, the land of the free and the asylum of the oppressed? Is it a Christian civilization that greets us upon the threshold by mob violence and follows our residence by obnoxious, cruel and discriminating laws? We might produce page after page rehearsing the outrages committed upon our people. In this connection we beg leave to call your attention to an extract from the report of a joint select committee, appointed by the Legislature of California in 1862, to inquire into the Chinese question.

Page 1192, Congressional report:

HON. R. F. PERKINS—*Chairman:* Your committee were furnished with a list of eighty-eight Chinamen, who are known to have been murdered by white people, eleven of which number are known to have been murdered by collectors of foreign miners' license tax—sworn officers of the law. But two of the murderers have been convicted and hanged. Generally, they have been allowed to escape without the slightest punishment.

The above number of Chinese who have been robbed and murdered, comprise probably a very small proportion of those which have been murdered; but they are all which the records of the different societies or companies in this city show. It is a well-known fact that there has been a wholesale system of wrong and outrage practiced upon the Chinese population of this State, which would disgrace the most barbarous nation upon earth.

Fifteen years have elapsed since that investigation, and who can say there has been any cessation of these murders and outrages.

S. Wells Williams, late Secretary of Legation at Pekin, in a recent publication calls attention to how faithfully the Chinese government has observed this compact, in the following words:

"By this article, the United States have bound themselves to treat the Chinese, as they ask them to treat American citizens, in a way which they have not bound themselves to do with any other nation. In China, its spirit and letter have, on the whole, been well carried out. In 1848, three men were executed for the murder of Rev. W. M. Lowrie, and six more banished; and in 1856, a man was executed at Fuhchau for killing Mr. Cunningham in a mob. This was by the Chinese authorities."

This government cannot evade the responsibilities it assumed by the arguments of the petty politician and demagogue, who, if not directly aiding the incendiary to apply the torch to the property of Chinese residents, gives his endorsement to the extreme and forcible measures adopted, and joins in the hue and cry of persecution. What has been demanded for the infinitesimal destruction of the property of Americans resident in China, in comparison with the wholesale destruction of the property of Chinese residents here! Mr. Williams further says:

To say that the great majority of Chinese now in our borders are fairly treated, and have been paid their wages, and that the cases of outrage and unredressed wrong form the vast exception, is simply to evade the responsibility which rests on a Government to secure protection to every individual within its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States properly requires and expects that every American citizen visiting or residing in China, shall be treated justly by the Chinese Government, and its consuls dwelling at the ports would soon be recalled if they failed to do their utmost to redress wrongs suffered in life, limb, or property by the poorest citizen. The Imperial Government has already paid out about $800,000 to indemnify the losses of our citizens within its territory. Some of these losses were incurred by the direct act of British forces setting fire to the houses of Americans, and in no case, almost, were they caused by direct attacks on them as such. Mission chapels have been destroyed, or pillaged by mobs at Tientsin, Shanghai, Fuhchau, and Canton, and indemnity made in every case.

How mortifying is the record of robberies, murders, arsons, and assaults, committed on peaceable Chinese living on the Pacific Coast, not one of whom had any power to plead their case, and most of whom probably suffered in silence! Do we excuse ourselves from fulfilling treaty obligations, the most solemn obligations a nation can impose on itself, and whose infraction always ought to involve loss of character and moral power, because the Chinese Government is a pagan government, and weak, too, as well? Can this nation look quietly on while Chinese are murdered, and their houses burned over their heads, in California, and no one is executed for such murders, or mulcted for such arsons; and then excuse itself for such a breach of faith because these acts were committed in that State, and no Chinese consul is there to plead officially for redress? It is not implied by this that no murderes has ever been executed for taking their lives, or robber punished for his crimes, but every one knows that such criminals do escape punishment, and that the Chinese in that State feel their insecurity and weakness. Woe be to them if they should at empt to redress their own wrongs!

EXAGGERATION OF THE QUESTION.

It is difficult to conceive why Congress should be memorialized in reference to the importation of Chinese prostitutes, in 1877, when that body passed a law in 1875, which completely stopped that class of immigrants arriving in the United States, the Chinese giving all aid in their power to effect this legislation. The act is discriminating in its effects alone against natives of China, notwithstanding it was shown in evidence before the Congressional Committee that the same class was, and are now, brought here for the same purposes, but were of the Caucasian race.

We do not desire to intimate even that the influences which

keep up this agitation (long after the act of Congress referred to), comes from this class, through our opponents, but we do declare that they charge that it is bringing disastrous results, on the same principle that Chinese *cheap* labor is ruining our fair land and degrading our youth, "and effecting *every* calling."

To show how necessary it is for our statesmen to constantly keep this question before the people, and to carry out their pledges given to the anti-Coolie element, and at the same time show the exaggerated statements sent forth in what ought to be, in manifestos from high authority, of undoubted and undeniable facts. Yet Governor Irwin, in his message, delivered yesterday, December 6th, says:

"It is unnecessary that I should make an argument to demonstrate the evils of Chinese immigration. In this State and everywhere on this coast, they are universally, or next to universally conceded. Nor are these evils regarded as of any ordinary character. The presence of the Chinese in this State in large numbers, with steady additions thereto through immigration, from the exhaustless hive in China, not only threatens an irrepressible conflict between the American and Chinese civilizations, but has actually initiated such conflict. If the right of unlimited immigration is conceded to the Chinese, as it is under the Burlingame treaty, and if Chinese immigrants are guaranteed in all the rights that immigrants from the most favored nations are, as they are under the same treaty, what is to prevent the triumph of their civilization in a modified form in its conflict with ours? Every one conversant with the state of affairs in this State, knows that if the present conditions guaranteed by the Burlingame treaty continue, there is imminent danger of precisely that result.

"Nay, I may go further, and say that that result is as certain as any event can be which is yet in the future; but upon this condition only, that the Chinese shall enjoy perfect and absolute protection here. Under the provisions of the Burlingame treaty their right to protection here is as perfect as is their right to come here. If, then, they shall be protected in their treaty rights—their right to come here and be protected while here—we shall most certainly be so far vanquished in the conflict that the resulting civilization will be essentially different in its character from the civilization of the Mississippi valley and the Atlantic seaboard.

"But it is not always possible for a government to do what it is legally and morally bound to do. It may be unable to furnish the protection which its treaty obligations and the laws of humanity require it to furnish. I have said an irrepressible conflict between the Chinese and ourselves—between their civilization and ours—has already been initiated. Now, if the unrestricted right of immigration shall continue to be secured to the Chinese, and they shall continue to exercise the right, there is danger, great danger, that this conflict will become so sharp, bitter and determined, that it will be difficult, or even impossible for the government—national or State, or both—to secure to them the protection to which they would be entitled, both by treaty and the laws of humanity. We are in imminent danger of this contingency, and will continue to be, as long as the Chinese shall continue to exercise the rights guaranteed them by the Burlingame treaty."

We most respectfully refer you to the facts embodied in evidence in the foregoing pages in refutation of every idea embodied in the foregoing extract, as well as the Senate Committee's "exhaustive report."

We now call your attention to the message of Mayor Bryant of this city, delivered to the Board of Supervisors, December 3, 1877, wherein the Chinese question is discussed thus:

"THE CHINESE.

"The last two years have seen a marked development of the Chinese question. The large number of people constantly arriving on these shores, and already here, have caused excitement, disturbances of the peace, and great uneasiness in the public mind.

"In the early months of 1876 the Chinese immigration was alarming, for its almost countless numbers."

Mayor Bryant's competitor in the late municipal election would not endorse the anti-coolie secret organization resolutions and was defeated by about fifteen hundred votes.

The Hon. J. F. Swift, recently elected to the Legislature from this city, true to his pledges, which caught the "agitators' vote," hastened on the first days of the session to say:

WHEREAS, The citizens of California, after a practical experience with the Chinese population in this State of more than 27 years, have become convinced of the following facts connected therewith:

First—That the Chinese who come to California consist almost exclusively of adult males, ignorant of our language, religion, customs and civilization, and that practically they remain so during their continuance among us; *that they come with no intention or desire of permanent residence;* that the Chinese, when they have amassed a certain sum of money, *invariably return to their own country*, but only to give place to other adult Chinese males, equally ignorant of our language and customs, so that the Mongolian population remains, after twenty years' aggregate residence, and always must remain, an alien and degraded race settled in our midst, having no sympathy or interest in common with our people, pernicious in time of peace, and useless, if not dangerous, in time of war.

The italics are ours. The Governor thinks they will stay here and overwhelm our civilization. Mayor Bryant sees in the "countless numbers" coming a second deluge. Mr. Swift says they don't stay nor ever have. Mr. Swift has never been classed as a political demagogue, and to prove his statements are based upon actual facts, we submit the following official document in reference to the overwhelming and "countless numbers," wherein our civilization—if this thing goes on—Governor Irwin declares will be "vanquished."

CUSTOM HOUSE, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.,
COLLECTOR'S OFFICE, December 7, 1877.

Statement of arrivals and departures of Chinese passengers at the port of San Francisco, from June 1st, 1876, to December 7th, 1877—eighteen months:

Departed	5086
Arrrived	4894
Excess of departures over arrivals	192

T. H. CRAIG, Col. Customs Clerk.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE, December 7, 1877.

I certify the above to be a correct transcript from the records of this office.

[SEAL] JAS. W. MCNABB, Deputy Collector.

How much more statesmanlike it would have been if His Excellency had stated the actual facts, whereby he could have allayed this "imminent danger," quieted the frenzy of the timid, and withheld the implied threat that neither State or national force could put down this mob spirit if Congress don't do this or that. The Custom House records were within easy reach. His Honor Mayor Bryant did procure this data, but his message fails to note this fact: That more Chinamen were returning than arriving, "in countless numbers."

In reference to the Burlingame treaty, our Governor insists that it is the cause of all his anxiety, and his anti coolie friends demand through him its abrogation, notwithstanding the fact that our whole Chinese immigration comes from the British port of Hong Kong.

S. Wells Williams says, page 1249, Congressional report:

I have heard the suggestion that a ready means of excluding the Chinese would be to abrogate the existing treaty between us and them, especially Article V of the Burlingame treaty.

Not to lay stress upon the fact that this portion of the treaty was urged upon the Chinese authorities by our own Government, and they accepted with some hesitatian, allowing fourteen months to elapse before they would exchange the ratifications, it may be accepted as certain that even if this fifth article was abrogated, it would have little or no effect upon the emigration.

The imperial government can no more control the movements of its subjects, or keep them within its territories, than the President can restrain those of our citizens; neither power can control or limit emigration or travel. Moreover, as few or no Chinese go to the United States from China itself, and no treaty between these two countries could influence emigration from British territory, or prevent ships loading at Hong Kong from receiving passengers, the proposition shows how little the question has been studied. It would furthermore be a strange proposal to make to the court of Peking, to abrogate an article in a treaty almost forced on its acceptance, less than ten years ago, because the Emperor's subjects had acted on its suggestions more extensively than we expected.

Your attention is called to the foregoing facts, in contradiction to the blind exaggerated assertions of our politicians, the whole tendency of which is readily seen.

IN CONCLUSION,

The United States and the Imperial Government of China recognize "the inherent and inalienable right" of either peoples to change their home and allegiance respectively, for the purposes of residence, trade or commerce, and each government reciprocally agrees to protect the citizens of both nations to the fullest extent, to that end. A large portion of our people have adopted commercial pursuits in this country, and from small beginnings have greatly aided in opening up a large and increasing trade between our respective countries. Every year we have noticed with plea-

sure its great increase, nurtured and fostered under these obligations, until now it reaches tens of millions in value annually. Who can foretell the future growth of trade and commerce between these two great and populous nations? Other foreign countries, who have heretofore enjoyed a large percentage of the commerce of the Orient, are looking with jealousy at the steady divergence of that traffic towards the United States--"the most favored nation." Great and powerful nations for a century have been endeavoring to break down the "Chinese wall of exclusiveness," that they might share her valuable commerce. England and France accomplished their object, after a great sacrifice of life and treasure.

This government adopted a far different course. It approached the Imperial Government of China with the "olive branch" of peace argument and reason, and succeeded in obtaining greater privileges than had been accorded to European governments, who backed their demands at the cannon's mouth; and since that time our commerce with China has continued to unfold itself into ever-enlarging circles.

You, as the law-makers of this great nation, are to decide whether you are to foster the existing relations between these two peoples and governments, or succumb to the demands of a faction, composed almost wholly of an agrarian element, of foreign birth, who make the Chinese question a pretext, endorsed and led by political demagogues and backed by the incendiary appeals of a daily press, located in the city of San Francisco. Where is your boasted independence, when an agrarian mob dictates what kind of labor you must employ? Where is your boasted freedom of speech, when a daily press dare not discuss both sides of a question or speak a word in favor of an abused and persecuted stranger? Where is that liberty your fathers fought for, that a mob, led by aliens, can undisturbed hold their daily gatherings, and threaten to hang your best citizens, burn their property and denounce them as thieves? And where does this lawless element look for encouragement, but to that class who occupy a higher political plane, whose exaggerated opinions concerning the Chinese we have quoted.

We make another reference to Governor Irwin's message, he says:

In justice, also, to the officers in the several counties, judicial and otherwise, who are charged in any manner with the duty of administering the laws, or of arresting, trying and punishing those guilty of breaking them, I desire to bear my testimony to the fidelity and impartiality with which they have discharged their respective duties. The Chinaman has had his rights adjudicated in the courts with the same fairness and impartiality that the

immigrant from any other country, or the citizen has had his; and the invader of the rights of the Chinaman, whether of person or of property, has been pursued with the same vigor, and punished with the same severity, as the invader of the rights of the white man.

In the name of international justice and right we ask His Excellency to answer. When our people were driven from Antioch, their property destroyed and lives threatened in open day, who was punished? Who, when our people's houses were set on fire by members of the order of Caucasians, near Truckee, and our people shot down as they attempted to escape was punished? Who, when quite recently they were driven from Rocklin, Penryn and Secret Ravine, and their property committed to the flames, was punished?

Is it necessary to call His Excellency's attention to the July riots in this Christian city, where their property was destroyed by wholesale; one of our countrymen murdered for daring to defend his domicile and his body thrown into the flames. Can his Excellency "bear testimony to the fidelity" with which the perpetrators of these recent outrages were punished? Is there one of the actors an inmate to-day of your jails or State Prison?

We now submit to your judgment the foregoing, and ask in the name of humanity a careful consideration of all its bearings, and most urgently do we seek and desire a comparison of the evidence for and against us. We do not desire to approach you as suppliants, as one of the fundamental principles of this great government is "that all men are born free and equal."

With due respect to the high position you occupy, we deem it but just that it you are to legislate upon a matter of such vital importance to the future relations between two great nations, it is due to you and those you represent that you have a correct knowledge and complete understanding with a clear conception of all the material facts connected with this, to us, important question. No good result can follow any action of yours if your conclusions are formed from exaggerated representations, however plausible they may have been presented to your notice.

Therefore to the statesman and philanthropist we submit our case, believing that whatever action is taken, it will be governed by justice and fairness.

(Signed) SIX CHINESE COMPANIES.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 8, 1877.